DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 296 985 SP 030 414

AUTHOR Sears, James T.; And Others
TITLE Teacher Education Policies and Programs: Implementing Reform Proposals of the 1980's.
INSTITUTION Southeastern Educational Improvement Lab., Research Triangle Park, NC.
PUB DATE Mar 88
NOTE 119p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; Admission Criteria; Change Strategies; *Educational Change; *Educational Legislation; *Educational Policy; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Student Recruitment; *Teacher Education Programs

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to examine the applications of educational reform proposals of this decade to teacher education. The first section discusses legislative initiatives regarding teacher preparation, and reviews three of the more recent teacher education reform reports issued after the first wave of these legislative efforts. Recognizing that the greatest challenge for educational reformers is to translate public policy into effective practice, section two highlights program changes and innovations which have been implemented within teacher education institutions during this decade. Based upon an analysis of the teacher education policies and programs discussed in this paper, the final section explores the potential long-term impact of these reform efforts upon teacher education and argues the need for more and better evaluative data on the effectiveness of these program reform-oriented strategies. A reference list of over 400 items is appended. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED296985

TEACHER EDUCATION POLICIES AND PROGRAMS:
IMPLEMENTING REFORM PROPOSALS OF THE 1980'S

PAPER PREPARED FOR THE

SOUTHEASTERN EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT LABORATORY

AT THE REQUEST OF

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA EDUCATIONAL POLICY CENTER

James T. Sears
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208

J. Dan Marshall
National College of Education
Evanston, IL 60201

Amy Otis-Wilborn
University of Wisconsin
Milwaukee, WI 53201

We would like to thank Rosemary Schiavi, our graduate research assistant on this project, Carol Moulden, the primary project librarian, as well as Barnett Berry, Tara Fulton, and Leonard Pellicer for their helpful suggestions and support.

March 1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. D. Marshall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP 030 414

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 3

Reform Reports Addressing Teacher Education
- The First Wave 5
- The Second Wave 14

Institutional Reform Policies and Programs
- Report Sample 19
- Recruiting Qualified Candidates 21
- Expanding Liberal Arts Education 26
- Providing Alternative Certification 29
- Enhancing Professional Coursework 34
- Extending Teacher Preparation Programs 40

First Wave Reform Efforts: A Tentative Assessment
- Introductory Remarks 46
- Forces Driving the Reform Movement 48
- Reform Assumptions 51
- Implementation of Reforms 54
- Problems in Implementation 58
- Reform Effectiveness 63
- Policy and Program Implications of the Reform Movement 67

End Notes 72

References 83

Appendices
- Appendix A

ABSTRACT

Five major teacher education reform areas have been targeted by the reform reports of the 1980s. This paper examines teacher education policies and programs that have been implemented in response to these major proposals. The strengths and weaknesses of these policies and programs are discussed. Based upon an extensive literature review, the authors conclude that, at this time, there is a paucity of second wave reform efforts at the evaluative levels. Reasons for the lack of evaluative efforts and the possible impact of these teacher education reforms are discussed.

Introduction

> *We are at a crucial time in the history of this reform effort. We have the legislation, the money, and the public support. Now we need to make the transition from broad mandates to technical implementation of changes involving large numbers of people, if we are going to keep this reform movement going for the next five or 10 years.*[1]

> *We have seen already a first set of reforms sweep the nation's schools. For the most part, the first wave can be described as "cheap" fix reforms -- raising high school graduation or college admissions standards, demanding more homework, increasing student performance testing, testing teachers in subject areas, recognizing outstanding teachers, students, and schools. More difficult reforms -- master teacher education programs, retraining teachers, improvement of curriculum materials, increasing academic time -- are meeting problems of cost and implementation.*[2]

During the 1980s, like a generation ago, policy makers have expressed concern about the effectiveness of our nation's schools in producing a competitive workforce.[3] The quality of teachers and their performance in the classroom have been questioned by more than a few scholars and laypersons.[4] Between 1980 and 1985 all but four states (Alaska, Nebraska, Utah, and Vermont) convened commissions or committees to study and recommend state educational reforms.[5] Several hundred state and national reform reports and proposals were issued.[6] Between 1980 and 1986, $4.2 billion dollars of additional monies were allocated by the states and their localities for elementary and secondary education.[7]

By mid-decade, teacher preparation had become a prime candidate for reform. Educational associations, private foundations, and executive and legislative bodies all issued reports which included proposals for teacher education reform.[8]

The purpose of this paper is to examine the applications of educational reform proposals of this decade to teacher education. The first section discusses legislative initiatives regarding teacher preparation, and reviews three of the more recent teacher education reform reports issued after the first wave of these legislative efforts.[9] Recognizing that the greatest challenge for educational reformers is to translate public policy into effective practice, section two highlights program changes and innovations which have been implemented within teacher education institutions during this decade. Based upon an analysis of the teacher education policies and programs discussed in this paper, the final section explores the potential long-term impact of these reform efforts upon teacher education and argues the need for more and better evaluative data on the effectiveness of these program reform-oriented strategies.

Reform Reports Addressing Teacher Education

> *We are getting back to basics in education, not only in programs we offer children, but also in placing responsibility for education back in the hands of superintendents, school boards, and state agencies.*[10]

> *[T]he present atmosphere of reform is that it is enormously political, that it is preoccupied with performance with no clear sense of the criteria by which performance may be judged, and that it is extrinsic with respect to the processes involved in young people learning about the world and themselves. It deals with such administrative abstractions as accountability, the testing of teacher's substantive competence, the relation between federal and local responsibility, all of which are doubtless important, but none of which, alas, can be shown to map directly on what happens in a classroom or in the head of a student or of a teacher.*[11]

The First Wave

In his inaugural address to the membership of the American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education, Robert Egbert exhorted his colleagues to "make educational excellence our leadership priority for 1980,"[12] and to engage the public in a dialogue about education's importance. At the same time the U.S. Department of Education, despite the Reagan administration's rhetoric about eliminating its cabinet-level rank, was selecting members for its National Commission on Excellence in Education.

The result of the work of this commission was the report released after two years of study, *A Nation at Risk* . It was then that the public debate about educational excellence and teacher competence began in earnest.[13]

Most states responded to the debate by convening committees or commissions to recommend changes in teacher education. Prior to the issuance of *The Nation at Risk*, only five states had developed plans or implemented policies.[14] Within three years, however, most states had enacted or were considering the enactment of policies affecting teacher education institutions and their students. Some of these policies focused on standards, others dealt with incentives. These legislative and institutional policy reform efforts represented the first wave of teacher education reform during the eighties.

The most popular directive for policy reform was to raise teacher standards. More stringent state certification procedures, most notably in the Southeast,[15] included mandating the testing of teacher candidates prior to their state certification. As 1988 begins, all but a handful of states require specific tests for teacher certification. National or state proficiency examinations of students' general knowledge, and basic skills, as well as of their subject area and professional knowledge are frequently used. While a majority of these states use one of the NTE tests, other tests that are used include the SAT, the California Achievement Test, and state-developed tests (Alabama, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, and Oklahoma).[16]

These legislative policies are designed to screen out the less committed and least qualified students.[17] Additionally, these policies are relatively easy to implement and demonstrate a rapid response to the public concern about teacher quality. Also, it is presumed that these policies might enhance the image of the profession and make it a more attractive profession in which to enter.

These policies, though, have weaknesses.[18] The use of standardized tests to screen prospective teachers decreases ethnic diversity within the teacher pool. In Houston, for example, the number of black teachers hired has dropped by one-third because of failure on these tests. In Louisiana, where nearly 40 percent of the student population is black, only 40 blacks a year have become teachers due to an 85 percent failure rate on the exit examinations.[19] The Educational Testing Service has concluded that by the beginning of the next century the number of minority students will have increased appreciably, but the number of minority teachers will have been reduced by nearly one-half, or about six percent of the total of these regulations continue.[20]

The validity of these entrance criteria is another concern. These tests are designed to assess knowledge and specific competencies -- not teacher performance. Knowledge of the subject matter is a necessary but by no means a sufficient indicator of effective professional performance. Further, many test items lack sufficient contextual detail for practitioners to render a reasonable judgment. The use of these tests in response to perceived public pressure squarely situates issues relating to

teaching within the technical arena. Fundamental educational and policy issues are seldom addressed.

Finally, standardization does not raise standards. For example, reform strategies reflect what one senior scholar[21] has described as "list logic": the identification of competencies of effective teachers or administrators through research and the subsequent testing for these discrete competencies or traits. Despite its promise to promote change, provide accountability, and confer credibility, these types of reform rest upon a set of questionable assumptions regarding school improvement, pupil performance, professional development, and curriculum change. Foremost is the assumption that teaching and teacher preparation can be broken down into a discrete set of behaviors and component parts.

Nevertheless, about a dozen states now mandate assessment of classroom teaching. Assessment tests and other assessment measures are based upon a set of *a-priori* criteria emanating from state boards, legislatures, or higher education institutions, administered by classroom outsiders, and generally summative in nature. In response to these more traditional reform efforts, others have proposed alternative assessment approaches, for example, the development of a support structure to assist teachers to evaluate the effectiveness of their own teaching. This type of "classroom research" is formative by design and grounded in the idiographic complexities of individual classrooms.[22]

The implementation of mentor-teacher programs is another attempt to provide a support structure for beginning teachers

while evaluating their classroom competence. Oklahoma was one of the first states to legislate entry-year assistance programs. Under an omnibus education bill[23], teacher candidates are eligible for entry into this program after they have completed college work from an accredited teacher education institution, passed a subject-matter examination, and been granted a state licence. The teacher must be under supervision of a committee of three educators for at least 120 school days. This committee recommends full certification for the candidate and prescribes a staff development program for the next year. Candidates have two opportunities to complete this entry-year assistance program. Other states which have mandated some form of induction year apprenticeship prior to teacher certification include Arizona, District of Columbia, Florida, North Carolina and Washington.[24]

The consequences of a novice teacher's failure to demonstrate classroom competence is not always felt by that individual alone. Some states, like Tennessee, place the burden for high failure rate of preservice teachers upon the preparing institution. Thus, any institution that has a failure rate of 30 percent or more is placed on probation for one year; failure to lower the rate below 30 percent the following year results in a revocation of program certification.[25]

Other policies initiated by the states have focused on <u>incentives</u>. These include providing alternative routes to state certification, and offering forgivable or low interest loans to students entering teaching.

Alternative certification policies have been been promulgated in many states to facilitate entrance into the profession.[26] In California, the Hughes-Hart School Reform Act of 1983 allows a college graduate with math or science training to pass the basic skills examination and to begin teaching. A permanent credential is obtained through successfully completing an apprenticeship program developed and supervised by public school personnel in those districts which are chosen to participate in the Mentor Teacher Program. The use of probationary apprenticeships for persons who are not prepared in teacher education institutions is also policy in Texas, Florida, Georgia, New Hampshire and New Jersey.[27] In New Jersey, a probationary teacher spends his or her first 20 to 30 days assisting in a classroom and participating in seminars ranging from classroom management to effective instructional techniques. Following this initiation period, the teacher assumes full-time teaching responsibility under the supervision of several colleagues. Advanced seminars in learning theory and student assessment are undertaken. Upon successful completion of the first year, the teacher is awarded certification. Other states' programs, like Arizona's "Partner Program," expect a teacher candidate to participate in a summer immersion program of professional studies followed by one semester of supervised classroom teaching. Elsewhere, in Louisiana and South Carolina candidates must complete all certification requirements within three years of beginning teaching.

Only a few states, however, completely bypass teacher education institutions. Bypassing traditional teacher preparation

through this apprentice-type arrangement has been severely criticized in the recent reports issued by the National Commission of Excellence in Teacher Education, and by the Holmes Group. One teacher educator succinctly articulated the concern:

> There is a significant difference between those professions or crafts in which one can simply pick up the tricks of the trade on the job, and those professions where a knowledge of the processes involved allowed for critical reflection upon and improvement of one's performance. . . .Let us not make the logical blunder of assuming that the question of how to teach will disappear if *courses* in how to teach disappear.[28]

A second form of incentives, scholarships and forgiveable or low interest loans, have been adopted by more than 20 states[29] for students pursuing degrees in shortage areas, particularly in science or mathematics. In Alabama, scholarships are awarded on a competitive basis to students who agree to teach three years for each academic year the scholarship is provided. In Alaska, students may receive a loan of up to $7,500 a year, which is forgiven after five years of teaching in a rural area. Connecticut provides forgiveable loans (up to $20,000 for those attending private colleges) to high school seniors scoring 1200 or above on the SAT and entering a teacher education program. Students who teach for five years need not repay the loan. In states such as Pennsylvania and Tennessee, educational loans are provided to experienced teachers in surplus fields who seek "retooling" in a shortage area.

At this point, the major advantages of these incentive policies are 1) that they enhance the public image of teacher

education, and 2) that they place greater demands on those institutions (teacher education programs, local schools) with whom these teacher candidates come into contact. These policies, of course, do little to resolve the expected teacher shortage and, in fact, may exacerbate the problem by channeling scarce available resources to a relatively small group of prospective teachers. Further, these policies assume the validity of an undocumented equation: *talented persons + teacher certification = quality education.*[30]

One would be mistaken to think that these reform efforts to elevate teacher standards and entice people into the classroom reflects innovative approaches in educational policy. Teacher education policy reform proposals are not new to education. During this century, scores of commissions, committees, and task forces have proposed recommendations to improve the quality of teacher education.[31] The development, implementation, and evaluation of these educational policies, however, are a rarity in the annals of educational history.[32] In his recent review of the past thirty years of educational criticism, Keesbury[33] concludes:

> These attacks were in response to the social, political and economic milieu rather than a careful analysis of how well schools were meeting their objectives. As a result, the criticisms of schooling came in the form of broad, sweeping generalizations, based on little or no evidence; and they were embraced and exploited by the media, special interests and intellectual dilettantes. It is little wonder that the reforms were ill conceived and ineffective.

Since the 1950s, there have been no fewer than four distinct reform movements.[34] Attempts to reform education, not surprisingly, have been viewed as cyclical. The metaphor of the pendulum often is used to describe this back-and-forth movement of school reform. Recently, policy makers have been exhorted by scholars[35] to assume a less reactive position and to conceptualize reform dialectically -- that is, to develop and implement a cohesive set of policies responsive to current social concerns which, in turn, raise more profound questions. A planned reform strategy would contribute to further reforms and spur social progress. As Wildavsky notes:

> Instead of thinking of permanent solutions we should think of permanent problems in the sense that one problem always succeeds and replaces another. Then we might ask whether today's answers are more moral or more effective than the solutions they succeeded or which they might replace.[36]

There are several reasons cited for the failure of reform movements to work in this dialectical manner. These include: the tenacity of institutional status quo and its chief beneficiaries; the conflicting principles often embedded within reform proposals; the tendency of policy makers to adopt pragmatic, "quick-fix" solutions based upon ease of implementation and political acceptability; and, the difficulty of transcending conventional assumptions to conceptualize imaginative alternative approaches to vexing problems.[37]

Unlike previous generations of educational policy reform, much of the interest and impetus for this present movement has

come at the state level. Unlike the efforts toward equality of opportunity engineered at the federal level 20 years ago, or the reform of curriculum and pedagogy inspired by subject matter experts a decade earlier, current educational policy making has come primarily from the states: the governor's office, the legislature, the state board of education, and executive branch agencies.[38] Some of the problems relating to implementation of reform policies of the early eighties, and concerns about the failure of these policies to address more profound structural problems in teacher education have contributed to the second wave reform reports of the mid-eighties.

The Second Wave

> *There are signs that the reform "movement" is now moving into a new phase. New voices are being heard, new concerns are being raised, new kinds of proposals are being advocated, and new coalitions are forming to press for their implementation. Some of the architects of the first wave of reform initiatives are acknowledging that their handiwork may need revising.*[39]

Mid-way through this decade, the second wave of reform proposals began to appear. Many proposals expressed the same themes as their predecessors: necessity for a liberal education, extended teacher preparation programs, strenuous education courses. Several of these reports acknowledged, however, that reforms were made in teacher preparation would be effective only if concomitant reforms were made in the structure of the school

workplace and in governance within the professions. These proposals included recommendations for "lead teachers," induction systems, mentoring, a national board of standards, and "clinical schools." Three of the most recent "second wave" national reports will be discussed briefly.

On the heels of *A Nation at Risk*, 17 education deans from many of the major research universities met to discuss ways to improve teacher education and to reform the teaching profession. As time passed, the Holmes Group expanded and substantial funding was provided.[40] In 1986, *Tomorrow's Teachers* was distributed. Among its set of interrelated recommendations were: extending teacher education programs to two years beyond the four-year baccalaureate; redesigning liberal arts curriculum and instruction in higher education; providing a subject-matter-centered curriculum for preservice teachers; recruiting academically talented persons, especially minorities, into teaching; incorporating induction year support systems; assessing teacher candidates through multiple methods developed and administered by the profession; establishing partnerships among university faculty, classroom teachers, and school administrators; and, differentiating teachers on the basis of experience, education, performance, and knowledge.[41]

This report has been criticized for proposing a singular teacher preparation model; for including only research-oriented universities in these major reform developments; for threatening the traditionally black institutions by luring away their most academically able prospective teachers; for failing to acknowledge

existing excellent teacher education programs and to build upon effective innovations of the past decade; for eliminating early undergraduate field experiences; and for generating additional student credit hours without fundamentally changing the structure and values of colleges and departments of education.[42]

During the spring of 1986, the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy issued its report, A *Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century*, prepared by a diverse group of 14 persons. Advocating sweeping changes in the teaching profession, a variety of recommendations -- some similar to those proposed by the Holmes Group-- were proposed. These include: the creation of a National Board of Professional Teaching Standards; the institution of four categories of teachers within the school headed by "lead teachers" who assist their colleagues in upholding these high standards and who are held accountable for school performance; the development of a professional graduate Master in Teaching degree; the creation of "clinical schools" linking elementary, secondary and higher education faculty; the coupling of teacher incentives with student performance; the implementation of internship and residency programs; the encouragement of alternative routes to teacher preparation; and, the preparation of more minority students for teaching.[43]

Critics of this report underscored its contradictory thrusts: advocating decentralized decision making in the schools while recommending a national board exacerbating the national educational bureaucracy; developing national standards assessed primarily through traditional testing procedures while recruiting

minority students into teaching; implementing a national examination without fostering a nationalized teacher education curriculum; and emphasizing additional undergraduate preparation in the arts and sciences while acknowledging the need for fundamental reform of this curriculum and noting the lack of influence and status of colleges of education within the university. Further, critics have questioned the wisdom of linking teacher compensation with student performance, ignoring the principal's role as the pivotal instructional leader within a school, viewing teacher education faculty as knowledgeable about recent teaching research and skilled in teaching concepts and skills, failing to consider vouchers and the value of competition in enhancing educational quality, ignoring a larger vision of society and education in the future, and neglecting issues of gender in school employment and leadership.[44]

The National Commission of Excellence in Teacher Education echoed many of the above cited reforms in its report, *A Call for Change in Teacher Education.* Among its recommendations were: careful screening, monitoring and testing of prospective teachers; a nation-wide campaign to recruit talented people, particularly minorities, into teaching; preparation of all prospective teachers in at least one academic major; an extended post-baccalaureate professional training program; a one-year internship for beginning teachers; a National Academy of Teacher Education for promising teacher educators; and, the development and evaluation of experimental teacher preparation programs.[45]

One concern that has been raised regarding the National Commission's recommendations is that extended exposure of prospective teachers to liberal arts faculty may be counter productive.[46] Providing prospective students greater exposure to those professors of the arts and sciences who place a low priority on teaching or who have little respect for classroom teachers is not likely to encourage students into teaching, enhance the self-esteem of prospective teachers, or model effective teaching strategies. Since many of the reports focus on increased exposure of undergraduates to the liberal arts and sciences, this concern continues to be relevant.

These, as well as other second wave reform proposals, echo several common themes:

1) Recruiting qualified candidates into the teaching profession, particularly high-ability high school students, liberal arts graduates, minorities, and professionals seeking mid-career changes;

2)Mandating liberal education requirements at least as strenuous as those for non-education college students;

3) Supporting alternative and experimental certification programs;

4) Enhancing professional coursework;

5) Extending teacher education programs.

The following section will highlight teacher education institutions which have implemented some of these proposals.

Institutional Reform Policies and Programs

> *The teaching profession should renew and strengthen its efforts to markedly improve the quality of teacher preparation and ensure an adequate supply of qualified teachers. In the future, inductees into the profession must know and demonstrate they have been prepared in programs utilizing the knowledge bases related to effective teaching and effective schools.* [47]

> *Higher salaries, more respect, fewer interruptions, more supportive service, few extraneous non-teaching duties, more planning time, and opportunities for continuing education and career development, are likely to have a salutary effect on teacher effectiveness. The great challenge, however, will be to apply any of these obvious improvements to the school bureaucracy and have them not be transformed into an opposite effect. . . .[C]ommon sense solutions will not simply strain through a bureaucracy; complex school organizations must be carefully worked with in the planning and execution of these solutions.* [48]

Report Sample

In order to obtain a reasonable sample of teacher education program descriptions, a systematic literature search was conducted for the years 1980 through 1987 using the following sources: *Current Index of Journals in Education, Education Index, Resources in Education, Dissertation Abstracts*, and the *ERIC* database. Additionally, 41 journals were independently reviewed.[49] Two professional librarians, three researchers familiar with the teacher education field, and a graduate research assistant conducted this search. Criteria for selection of an article or paper were: 1) the reform was identified with a specific institution within the United States and initiated after January 1,

1980;[50] and, 2) the reform, at least in part, addressed one of the six major themes identified in the second wave reports.

From this review of the literature, we located 45 reform programs.[51] From the more than 100 articles, papers, and documents discussing reform programs in teacher education, approximately 7 percent were prescriptive, 60 percent were descriptive, 1 percent were evaluative, and 22 percent were largely descriptive with a brief, generally impressionistic, evaluative commentary. A chart which cites these programs, located in Appendix A, notes the focus of their reform efforts, and categories the nature of the document. Only articles with descriptive and evaluative intent have been cited in this section.

Institutions of teacher preparation engage in educational reform for a number of reasons: to raise the quality of students admitted into their programs; to enhance the quality of those who graduate from their programs; to respond to public and professional criticisms; and, to fulfill state or institutional mandates. An example of the activities of programs reported in this paper demonstrate that most programs' rationales for implementing a "reform" strategy parallels the recommendations proposed in one or more of the reports. The examination of institutional reform across major areas of reform was, then, possible.

The five major areas of reform activity discussed in this section are: recruiting qualified students; expanding liberal arts education, providing alternative certification; enhancing professional coursework; and extending teacher preparation

programs. Following the discussion of each, strengths and weaknesses are noted.

Recruiting qualified candidates

Throughout the decade teacher education programs focusing on recruitment have used one or more of the following strategies: (1) provide incentives to recruit qualified/quality persons into teacher education; (2) implement screening procedures to eliminate less-qualified persons from teacher education; and (3) promote the profession to potential students. Prior to 1983, most programs stressed recruitment as a vehicle for attracting *qualified* persons into particular subject or certification areas. By the mid-eighties, however, the stated purpose had changed to a search for *quality* students into the teaching profession.

Prior to the first wave reports, The College of Education at the University of South Florida's Sun Coast Teacher Training Program (SCATT) offered scholarships to prospective teachers with grade point averages of 3.5 or higher, standardized test scores of 21 on the ACT or 1000 on the SAT, and outstanding letters of recommendation.[52] Beginning in 1981, this honors program provided enrichment activities (e.g., seminars and clinical teaching experiences) to those students who met these rigorous criteria. Prior to 1983, other institutions had increased their admissions requirements. For example, University of Kansas[53] students entering their fifth year of professional studies were expected to have a minimum grade point average of 2.75. Other teacher preparation programs, like that at the University of New

Hampshire,[54] routinely advised nearly one-half of interested education students out of its preparation program before they accumulated a large number of professional education credits. The intention, clearly, was to change the notion that anybody could become a teacher. These schools simply became more selective.

By mid-decade, recruitment strategies had become more elaborate and more extensive, and, as noted earlier, had a decidedly changed focus. The Lyndhurst Fellowships at Memphis State and the University of Tennessee at Knoxville, the Brackenridge Interns at Trinity University, and the Honors Scholars at Wright State University exemplify the emphasis on providing incentives to attract "quality" persons into teaching. The Lyndhurst fellows are recent college graduates who are paid $10,000 for one year of teaching a two-thirds load and provided with seminars and coursework. This follows a summer of intensive professional preparation.[55] The Brackenridge Interns are graduating high school seniors who receive four years of intensive professional and liberal arts education through a forgiveable loan, coupled with a commitment to two years of public school teaching.[56] Honors Scholars and Multi-Cultural Scholars are "high-ability" high school students or college undergraduates who enter Wright State's teacher education program.[57] About 15 full-tuition scholarships are provided to students who evidence superior academic performance and ability, demonstrate a commitment to teaching and community service, and have strong recommendations from their high school teachers.

Students participating in each of these programs are described as "high-ability" students scoring well on standardized tests and in school performance. Underlying these practices is the belief that these characteristics are reflective of a student's "quality" -- a presumed asset to the program and the profession. Admittance is extremely competitive; one in ten eligible students are accepted.

Although many of the reform reports note the importance of recruiting talented minority students, few such programs are reported in the literature. Bowling Green State University[58] has developed a set of short-range and long-range recruitment objectives. These include: engaging campus leaders (e.g., the vice-president of minority affairs) in recruiting minority students into teaching; offering $2,000 minority achievement awards and other scholarships; implementing an extensive media campaign; purchasing names from the College Board of minority students scoring well on the PSAT/NMSQT; and, hiring more minority faculty. Wright State University[59] also actively recruits minority students into teaching by offering scholarships to academically able high school students and providing summer enrichment programs to these students in the sophomore, junior and senior high school years. Alabama State University, Norfolk State University, and Coppin State University target "high potential" eighth and ninth grade minority students who express an interest in teaching as a career and provide them with enhancement activities, basic skills reinforcement, test-taking instructions, and scholarships.[60]

Increasing admission standards became nearly the norm as the decade of the eighties progressed.[61] Ranging from private colleges (e.g., Radford), to state institutions (e.g., University of Tennessee, University of South Carolina), schools, colleges and departments of education employed screening methods including grade point average, basic skills tests, achievement tests, socio-emotional assessment, and communication skills to restrict admissions.[62] The University of Tennessee at Knoxville,[63] for example, established enrollment limits and created an admissions board composed of two education professors, one teacher, one liberal arts professor, and one education student.

Given the problem of attracting qualified minority students into teaching, some colleges have begun to use alternative admission standards including consideration of a person's past accomplishment, motivation, study habits, leadership, sensitivity, and potential for learning. Florida A & M University[64] requires some students applying for admission to its teacher preparation program (those scoring less than 835 on the SAT or 17 on the ACT) to complete a two-day assessment program measuring competencies and qualities through a variety of exercises. One four-hour block is composed of group exercises among six candidates observed by the evaluation team. Another eight-hour block is devoted to individual assessment activities. Students then denied admission to the college are given a written report noting their deficiencies with suggestions for improvements. Students may re-apply after one year.

Perhaps the most novel strategy, adopted by several institutions, is the design of public relations activities to promote the profession of teaching. Two groups most often targeted by this reform measure are high school students and entering college freshmen. Bowling Green University[65] invites minority students with grade point averages above 3.4 and ACT composite scores above 24 to spend a day visiting the campus accompanied by an education student. At the University of Dayton[66] recruitment letters and telephone calls are directed at high school faculty, "intellectually talented students" and their parents inviting them to visit the campus and participate in orientation activities. Following a successful program for attracting young persons into the career of business, Central Washington University[67] initiated "education week" for outstanding high school juniors and seniors in the summer of 1986. The goals are to have prospective candidates become more aware of the complexities and challenges of teaching and to encourage them to seriously consider teaching as a career. For one summer week, more than 150 students throughout the state attend assemblies, participate in small group dialogue, and engage in recreational activities directed by leading educators and experienced teachers.

Efforts to recruit qualified candidates into teacher preparation programs have both strengths and weaknesses. Some of these are cited below:

Strengths:

1)Appeal to public concern for upgrading teaching standards;

2)Are easily implemented and easy to understand;
3)Facilitates entry into teaching of persons who might not have normally considered it as a short-term career; and,
4)Restrict entry into the profession.

Weaknesses:[68]
1)Raised minimum grade-point averages and minimum aptitude test scores does not increase the pool of students with high academic ability;
2)Raised minimum standards through the above mentioned measures reduces the percentage of minorities entering into teaching;
3)Forgivable loan programs may only retain persons in teaching for the number of years required to retire the loan;
4)Recruitment efforts stress attracting "quality" students defined by a narrow set of criteria;
5)Recruitment efforts for non-traditional students directed at high school counselors have questionable effectiveness; and,
6)Repayment of loans in past programs have not been high.

Expanding Liberal Arts Education

The renewed emphasis on the importance of a liberal arts education has been manifested in two ways by teacher education reform programs: more concentration on completion of "core courses" and greater liberal arts exposure of education students, with particular attention to persons pursuing an elementary education degree. The majority of program descriptions reviewed implemented both reforms simultaneously. Compensation was made by either a decrease in exposure to professional education courses or an extension of students' overall program of study.

Early in the 1980s, the University of Maine at Orono implemented a wholly redesigned undergraduate teacher education program.[69] Rooted in the belief that the education of preservice teachers is the responsibility of all faculty, this program reflects

a collaborative effort by faculty from all departments within the School of Education and their professional colleagues throughout the University's other schools and colleges. A similar developmentally-based, liberal arts-oriented undergraduate program was begun in the mid-1970s at the College of St. Teresa.[70]

Prior to the mid-eighties, most institutions reviewed in this study, such as the University of Florida, the University of Kansas, Doane College. and Austin Teacher's College, chose to lengthen their course of study.[71] For example, The University of Florida's PROTEACH program reflects a rigorous and extensive general education component coupled with a comprehensive subject matter training. "Advances in nearly all fields," writes a PROTEACH staff person, "require that teachers be more fully prepared in their teaching fields."[72] Thus, the 42-54 semester hours required outside of the professional and general education requirement represents the student's knowledge base. Examples of other requirements in this program include two lab courses in the physical and biological sciences for elementary teachers, two years of foreign language study for all prospective teachers, and a statistics course. This is, of course, in addition to the "core" curriculum requirements.

As the decade reached its mid-point, program descriptions of reforms were more apt to reflect a willingness to engage students at an early point in their college education, and to better integrate the liberal arts experience with the professional education component. At the University of Tennessee and Trinity University in Texas, the program of professional studies begins at the freshman year, although all education students enroll in the college of arts

and sciences to complete an intensive preparation in their content fields.[73] At the Curry School of Education[74] at the University of Virginia, education and liberal arts faculty share responsibility for the preparation of teachers. Some colleges have provided selective liberal arts experiences to their education students. For example, San Francisco State University implemented a series of interdisciplinary, team-taught semester courses on global futures for prospective teachers.[75]

Elementary and special education students at the College of Education at Texas A & M University spend four years completing their baccalaureate in a program with an expanded general education component in their six-year preparation experience.[76] Changes in teacher education at the University of South Carolina at Columbia reflect a similar "stretching" of preparation. This program is now characterized as "an extended baccalaureate degree program whereby students. . .receive a broader liberal arts education, earn their baccalaureate degree in majors or interdisciplinary concentrations other than education, and receive their preparation for initial certification by completing one of the professional programs. . ."[77]

The five-year program at Memphis State University has prospective teachers enrolled in the College of Arts and Sciences as undergraduates while they complete a designated preteaching program of professional and field experiences.[78] This program was completely redesigned to reflect a more "generic" approach to preservice teacher education and more intensive preparation in content fields.

Reports found in the literature suggest that the expansion of liberal arts has been accomplished in numerous ways. These efforts, too, have their strengths and weaknesses -- some of which are listed below:

Strengths:

1)When wholistically conceived and successfully implemented programs of this type are more likely to erase the false separateness of liberal arts and professional preparation;
2)Reforms focused on general education coursework can provide opportunities for genuine collaboration among faculty;
3)Programs which pepper their liberal arts focus with early (freshman and/or sophomore) professional coursework and field experiences give prospective teacher education students early opportunities to make more informed career decisions;
4)Potentially increases the general knowledge base of teachers; and,
5)Increases the commitment of students to learning in a variety of content areas.

Weaknesses:[79]

1)Most students experiencing problems in teaching have difficulty with problems in classroom techniques, not a poor understanding of subject knowledge;
2) Extra time in college may discourage students, particularly those with limited financial resources; and,
2)The assumption that increased exposure to content will facilitate students' classroom teaching is undocumented.

Providing Alternative Certification

As discussed earlier in this paper, the impetus for developing alternative certification procedures generally has been state mandates. Several higher education institutions, however, have designed and implemented some type of alternative program on

their own. By minimizing entry requirements, these programs use on the job training and support personnel to facilitate the teacher training process. Alternative certification programs have been targeted to a specific market with the goal of attracting persons with related experience or a specific knowledge base into teaching. These candidates include persons seeking a career change, recent liberal arts graduates, and persons entering retirement at middle-age.

The shortage of mathematics and science teachers prompted Wright State University[80] to develop a program located at Patterson Air Force Base. The program works to certify retiring service personnel with expertise in these subject areas and consists of a 27 to 30 month curriculum of evening coursework, one week of clinical immersion, and a one-half day per week clinical experience.

In another instance where this reform was in place prior to 1982, the University of Bridgeport[81] initiated a "medical intern" program modeled after the internship process through which physicians are trained. This program engages school districts in an equal partnership with the university in teacher preparation. Post-baccalaureates are assigned as substitute teachers and attend education courses throughout their year of substitute teaching. Noting that the "most central advantage is a better product," a comparison of the Bridgeport alternative-certified teachers with those graduating from the traditional program found that the alternative-certified teachers scored higher on the NTE. Additionally, these teachers were more likely to be teaching

following the completion of their training than those who participated in the traditional program.[82]

Under the aegis of massive reform in South Carolina, the state legislature directed the creation of alternative certification routes. Winthrop College[83] responded with a multi-phase program. Candidates with a bachelor's degree in a critical subject area complete a one week institute in which they are exposed to effective teaching. research and are evaluated through a series of peer teachings. Candidates then return to their home district for a one-year teaching assignment punctuated by eight seminars conducted under the supervision of Winthrop College faculty. These seminars focus upon assertive discipline, student motivation, teaching low achievers, and promotion of higher level thinking skills. Working with personnel in their own districts, candidates must earn a satisfactory evaluation on the Assessment of Performance in Teaching evaluation, complete their one-year teaching assignment, and be offered a new contract. Candidates who complete these requirements earn three credits from Winthrop College and enter into four weeks of summer training at the college where their teaching skills are refined. Staff members then visit candidates at their school sites to insure that teaching competencies are practiced in the classroom. Six additional credit hours are awarded at the completion of this second phase. The final phase requires candidates to complete three additional graduate courses within the next three years in three areas: educational psychology, reading, and exceptional children. Completion of this third phase results in state certification.

The Lyndhurst Fellowship Program, mentioned earlier, is another example of "second wave" alternative certification reform.[84] Limited to persons with "strong baccalaureate degrees" in secondary school subjects, "fellows" go through an intensive ten-week program before their year-long teaching internship begins. During their year in a classroom, they teach three classes per day and spend the remainder of the day planning and evaluating with assigned mentor teachers. Interns also attend campus-based seminars throughout the year.

A very different alternative certification model was initiated in 1985 at the University of Maryland.[85] This one year program (leading to certification and a Master's degree) is designed with an integrated, theory and research based curriculum with an emphasis on problem-solving and reflection. The curriculum includes campus and field experiences designed to provide a repertoire for the beginning teacher. Participants (referred to as "scholar teachers") complete the program as a cohort group. Unlike other induction or intern experiences in classrooms, the Maryland alternative certification program conducts "supervised apprenticeships" according to the principle of distributed practice. That is, scholar teachers visit and work in multiple classrooms and schools. Each extended experience is followed by a period of reflection. Thus, in contrast to the previously-described programs at Winthrop and the University of Tennessee at Knoxville, the Maryland program remains campus-based.

While most alternative certification programs seem to be vehicles for attracting academically talented students or persons

with undergraduate degrees in "shortage areas," exceptions do exist. Texas A & M University's physical education certification option of nine semesters "was developed in response to the expanded knowledge base in exercise physiology and other content areas as well as the desire to provide a full semester of student teaching. . .in a field in which shortages do not exist and where competition for jobs is tough."[86]

Regardless of their configuration, length, or primary base, paths to alternative certification are both popular and diverse. Some of their generic strengths and weaknesses can be found below:

Strengths:[87]
1)Attracts more mature and experienced persons into teaching;
2)Reduce shortage of teachers in critical content areas;
3)Encourage experimentation and competition in teacher preparation; and,
4)Reduce the issuance of emergency teaching certificates.

Weaknesses:[88]
1)De-emphasis of pedagogical preparation within the university setting;
2)Little research to substantiate alternative preparation is equivalent to the conventional approach;
3)May undercut the teaching profession by substituting craft-like training for novices;
4)Tend to cram content and experiences together into a single year (often from one summer to the next) in a fashion that diminishes the likelihood of reflection; and,
5)Perceived to be pedagogically "thin" since by their design there is little time to explore the depth and breadth of the foundations for pedagogy.

Enhancing professional coursework

Those programs which altered, improved, or redesigned their professional education component reported doing so for one or more of the following reasons: (1) to increase preservice teachers' knowledge base and teaching skills; (2) to link theory presented in courses with teaching practice; and/or, (3) to foster a partnership with local schools.

Preparation programs, like those at Memphis State, Radford University, and the University of Virginia's Curry College of Education sought to "demonstrate accountability for both knowledge and skill acquisition in the various areas of professional education."[89] Among the methods employed to accomplish this task were individualized programs of study, competency-based instructional models, quality warranties, and interactive technology (e.g., simulations, micro-teaching).

At the University of Tennessee[90], students meet with advisors each quarter to discuss performance progress in field work and courses. The advisor may recommend remedial activities for the student or counsel the student into another field of study. Competency-based models have been adopted by Radford University and Southeast Missouri State.[91] At Grambling College, a predominantly black institution, there has been a renewed effort to improve test scores of students through a competency-based approach.[92]

The concept of "quality assurance" implemented by some institutions of teacher preparation clearly is related to a concern for accountability of teacher graduates' knowledge and skills.[93]

More than a dozen teacher preparation institutions have adopted some type of warranty assurance program including Oregon State University-Western Oregon State College, Curry School of Education, the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff, University of Northern California, Grambling State University, and Doane College. Though the specifics of each program differ, all incorporate a careful evaluation of first year teacher-graduates and promise an institutional commitment to provide support services to the novice teacher and his or her school. Typically, the institution provides free university services, ranging from free courses, site evaluations, in-service activities, and counseling to "warrantied teachers" for one or two years[94]

Other program have sought to link theory with practice. The Curry School of Education's[95] curriculum integrates all courses, labs, and field experiences around focal concepts and skilis. Iowa State University's project,[96] "Teachers on Television," provides pre-student teaching opportunities to observe live classroom proceedings transmitted 20 days each semester to a campus observation center. The Memphis State[97] program provides field experience, coupled with coursework, beginning in the freshman year. Three levels of field experience are provided to students. These vary with respect to components of observations and participation in classroom activity. The University of South Carolina integrates extensive clinical field work with course knowledge resulting in a "broad increase in the quantity and quality of practice field experiences."[98]

Some programs have shaped their curriculum around innovative concepts, philosophies, or themes to enhance and unify teacher preparation. Borrowing heavily from a social-reformist framework, the curriculum at Knox College[99] is integrated around the theme of social change and critical analysis. Students conduct classroom ethnographies, critically analyze curriculum materials, and develop liberatory teaching skills as the faculty merge social and educational theory with classroom teaching and learning.

Western Montana College responded to the needs of prospective rural teachers by establishing a special Rural Education Option for its preservice teachers.[100] Through the assistance of an applied anthropologist, the curriculum includes an introduction to cultural anthropology while addressing various aspects of rural teaching and the problems of teacher adjustment in rural communities.

Another specific program change occurred at St. Cloud University in Minnesota.[101] Reflecting the growing professional awareness of middle school students (and responding to legislated mandates), the Early Adolescent Block Program was created for persons wishing to teach in middle schools. Consisting of 19 quarter hours, the courses cover philosophy, psychology, interdisciplinary teaming, and special problems pertaining to the teaching and learning of young adolescents.

The University of Florida's PROTEACH program reflects a reconceptualized common core of courses which includes knowledge of teaching's social milieu, historical and philosophical foundations of education, and generic pedagogical knowledge.[102]

This competency-based program stresses the following areas in its generic knowledge focus: diagnosis, instructional planning, instructional management, observations, interpersonal relations. Its theory/practice link is argued from the position that "recent research on teaching and learning, especially the process-product research, reflects information essential for effective beginning teachers."[103]

A third area of concern for teacher preparation institutions reforming their professional preparation curriculum is to develop partnerships between them and local school districts. Developing a long-term working relationship with local school districts and incorporating their teachers in the professorial activities of the university has become an important aspect of the current reform movement.[104]

Partnerships generally have been developed in the field or pre-student teaching component. At Brown University, education faculty assume clinical professorial roles at a local high school as they assist in teaching methods courses, coordinating student teaching, developing curricula, and team-teaching. The underlying premise of this program is the "empowerment of teachers and the centrality of the school site in educational reform efforts."[105] At Winthrop College, the interdisciplinary core for preservice teachers is team taught by college faculty and public school teachers ("resident scholars") working at the college.[106] This includes a three-hour freshman course introducing students to teaching, a six-hour junior block focusing on the learner, and a 21-hour senior year beginning in the summer and extending through

student teaching. The University of Alabama,[107] in partnership with the Tuscaloosa City School System, has also implemented a "teacher in residence program." Two teaching fellows are selected each year from the primary and intermediate school levels. These "outstanding classroom teachers" serve as full time faculty in early childhood and elementary education undergraduate program.

In collaboration with the Richmond City Public Schools, Virginia Commonwealth University[108] integrated preservice and inservice education. This Collaborative Teacher Education Program (Co-TEEP) is a jointly planned, implemented, and evaluated program in which inservice teachers and their schools assume a major role in the preparation of elementary teachers. Two major program components are a five-week workshop-seminar, "Trends in Teaching," and a 15-week "Instructional Leadership Seminar."

The University of Bridgeport program, described earlier, is perhaps the most unusual example here.[109] Designed to address the multiple needs of (1) better-trained teachers, (2), closer ties between the university and surrounding school districts, and (3), those districts' need for competent substitute teachers, Bridgeport's "learning-by-doing" model takes its students through an intensive week of "survival skill" training before their one year placement a substitute teachers. School district personnel and university faculty share in all responsibilities, including initial interviews, supervision, and seminars. The student's full tuition and bi-monthly stipend for expenses are assumed by the school districts in which they work.

Partnerships also have been developed between colleges of education and the business community. For example, at the University of Massachusetts[110] a network of school systems and corporations formed a partnership to recruit and prepare "top college graduates" in the fields of mathematics, science, or English. This 15 month masters program includes summer coursework, a semester of corporate internship, and a semester of teaching internship. During the three years that these candidates agree to teach, summer employment options are provided by corporations. School systems and corporations work with the University in the selection and evaluation processes.

The enhancement of professional coursework has, like the other reform agendas, been interpreted and implemented in numerous forms. Some of their accompanying strengths and weaknesses follow:

Strengths:

1)Attention to professional education curricula provides an opportunity for teacher education faculty to revitalize coursework, to reflect current professional through, and to integrate field and clinical experience with campus learning;
2)Redesigning professional courses reduces the likelihood of overlapping content and experiences; and,
3)Opportunities for teacher education faculty to collaborate among themselves and with the K-12 educational community.

Weaknesses:[111]

1)Business partnerships with schools may lead schools to shape their curriculum around the parameters and interests of the corporate sector rather than that of its profession and clients;

2)Program reconceptualization is an arduous, time-consuming task often complicated by organizational structure;
3)Lack of proper supervision and appropriate models;
4)Program redesign is made more difficult by the need to have courses and field components reflect state certification requirements;
5)Partnerships rarely serve all participants equally well. Differing cultures and status patterns work against mutually beneficial collaboration; and,
6)Competency-based programs routinize and underplay the complexities of teaching.

Extending Teacher Preparation Programs

Extended programs are not new to teacher education; they have, however, undergone a renaissance during the reform movement of the 1980s.[112] These programs demand five or more years of college education prior to a student entering the classroom as a certified teacher.[113]

About one-third of the programs reviewed for this study,[114] like the University of Florida's PROTEACH mastery-oriented program,[115] that implemented an extended program resulted in a student earning a master's degree. Only a few of those which mandate a fifth year of training at the graduate level do not grant a master's degree. One of these is the University of Kansas, which implemented its program in 1981.[116] Beginning with observations and continuing through a series of short and long-term clinical experiences, students culminate their fifth year with two distinctively different student teaching experiences. Prior to their fifth year experience, students often enroll in an introduction to education course team taught by a faculty member from the

education department and one from the counseling department. Many also elect multi-cultural education and child-study courses.

The University of New Hampshire's extended program, developed during the 1970s, is one of the most elaborately designed. Occurring in distinct phases, students enter the third and final phase early in their senior year. Following completion of their undergraduate program, students begin graduate study in the summer, complete a one-year teaching internship, and return to campus for more coursework the following summer. Certified to teach, those wishing to complete the master's degree must take an additional 18 semester hours and complete a thesis or project. The University of South Carolina's "extended baccalaureate" degree is another extended model which does not culminate in a graduate degree.

Teacher induction programs are the most common extended preparation programs which do not result in a student earning an advanced degree.[117] As discussed in the previous section of this paper, teacher induction is often the focus of policy decisions made by state legislatures. Oklahoma is one of these states. The principal role of teacher education institutions, like Oklahoma State University, is to provide one of the three representatives to serve on novice teacher entry level assistance committees and to conduct research on the effectiveness of the induction program.[118]

Other teacher preparation institutions, like Doane College, Emporia State College, the University of New Mexico, and Southern Oregon State College,[119] have developed induction programs on their own initiative. Emporia State's program does not contain a

formal evaluation component but instead provides beginning teachers with a dialogic forum, through a series of three hour seminars. On the other hand, Doane College faculty routinely visit first year teachers, providing evaluative feedback to them and their school supervisor. First year teachers also participate in workshops conducted by Doane faculty.

The vast majority of extended teacher education programs, like the University of Maine at Orono,[120] are a continuation or extension of a four year program of study. Graduates from the Curry School of Education program, designed with the recommendations the AACTE report and B.O. Smith's proposal in mind,[121] receive a BA degree, a Masters of Education degree, and a teaching certificate.

Austin College's 15 year old five-year program is similar in several respects.[122] While students work through their baccalaureate in a "regular" discipline, those who aspire to teaching also take a series of four education labs which they can begin as early as their second college semester. The first of these is largely an overview of teaching; the second includes a practicum with focused observation; the third is campus-based and develops philosophical and methodological foundations of education; and, the fourth combines 50 hours of classroom teaching with a campus seminar. After receiving the bachelor's degree, prospective teachers spend a fifth year doing student teaching (an entire semester) and taking additional courses both within and outside of the Education Department. Successful completion results in the master's degree.

The extended program at Memphis State University also involves students in designated undergraduate education-related courses and an intensive fifth-year program of professional studies in an extended internship. Graduates receive their master's degree and are recommended for certification.[123]

Others, like the University of Nebraska and the University of Maryland, offer a fifth year of study. The contrasts between these two programs reflect the varying emphasis of substantive thought given to program reform. At Nebraska, students who have earned their four-year degree simply take only 12 graduate hours.[124] At Maryland,[125] the fifth-year curriculum is an integration of theory and research which emphasizes student learning, instructional process, the social context, and leadership. The program, initiated after a year and one-half of faculty discussion and planning, is oriented to "scholar-teachers" who complete "rigorous demands" of the program drawn from four fields of inquiry: research on teaching, cognitive psychology, models of teaching developed from theories of learning, and research on teaching. Prior to completion of their program, each participant completes two major research projects requiring them to gain mastery of a particular field of study and to conduct a classroom-based action research project.

In our sample, only one institution, Texas A & M University, established a six-year program of teacher education. Echoing the Holmes Group report, the faculty sees itself "in a unique position to play a significant role in the reform movement in Texas."[126] Its elongated program is described as follows:

> The program requires additional hours in a teaching major and an expanded general education component, as well as special pedagogical studies aimed at serving persons with handicaps. It provides a unique undergraduate and graduate clinical experience including an internship and an induction year prior to licensing. In this program, students complete the Bachelor's degree after four years, meet certification requirements after five years, and get the Master's degree after six years of study and practice. The sixth year is the induction year on the job.[127]

Whether they represent comprehensive five- or six-year programs or separate, fifth-year additions, extended teacher education programs appear popular. Some of their overall strengths and weaknesses include:

Strengths:[128]

1)Provides opportunity for extended work in the liberal arts and sciences as well as in specific teacher content areas;
2)Provides badly needed support structure for first year teachers;
3)Reflects the increased specialized preparation comparable to other professions;
4)Greater amount of time to focus on pedagogy;
5)Reduces scheduling and other undergraduate institutional conflicts; and,
6)Greater opportunities for extensive collaboration and clinical experiences with teachers and schools.

Weaknesses:[129]

1)These programs are expensive to provide and, therefore, will be particularly difficult for black and small liberal arts colleges to implement, and for students with limited financial resources to attend;
2)Little data to support the superiority of extended programs over the conventional four-year approach;[130]

3)Extended length of teacher preparation does not necessarily address within-program variables such as the quality of instruction;
4)May over-emphasize or de-emphasize the professional preparation program;
5)Premature to give up on four-year preparation until genuine reforms are implemented at the undergraduate level; and,
6)Smaller institutions with less resources and a predominantly undergraduate student body cannot sustain such a program.

First Wave Reform Efforts: A Tentative Assessment

> *The pattern of educational reform has been to generate a lot of enthusiasm, reform the curriculum, raise standards restore prestige to teaching -- and then somehow have the improvements swept away again by a rising tide of mediocrity.*[131]

> *Our review of empirical research on preservice teacher education suggests that the number of studies of teacher preparation may actually be lower in the last ten years or so than in each of the previous two decades.*[132]

> *Based upon performance to date, I must predict that the current state-level policy initiatives in the area of teacher education are not likely to provide many lasting benefits.*[133]

> *H. L. Mencken once observed that for every complex problem there is a simple solution, and it is usually wrong. For preservice teacher education, simple solutions abound, and most, if not all, are in the final analysis, wrong.*[134]

Reviewing possible scenarios for the future of teacher education in the midst of the reform debate, a former president of ATE underscored the importance of teacher educators in incorporating research and knowledge.[135] Interestingly, with the exception of *A Call for Change in Teacher Education*, none of the major reports noted the importance of research in either the development of educational policies and programs or in their evaluation. While accrediting associations, such as NCATE, expect institutions to continually evaluate existing programs, most evaluation is summative in nature and primitive in design.[136] During the last decade, there were few published reports regarding institutional program evaluation.[137]

Though a number of the program-specific articles reviewed in this study mentioned concerns and acknowledged the importance of formative evaluation as an integral program component, remarkably few descriptions contained any acceptable data-based information.[138] In short, little research documenting the effectiveness of the reform efforts in teacher preparation is currently available. A recent study examining educational reform and policy making in seven states,[139] concluded that state policy makers, state agencies, and legislative staffs seldom conduct their own program research, rarely provide research guidance to others, and only occasionally have available research findings from the scholarly community.

While there are limitations to knowledge acquired through research, research is one important component in the development of sound policies and programs.[140] Even when demonstration programs are developed, implemented and rigorously evaluated, they seldom have an impact on a larger scale.[141] Without some knowledge base of teacher education programs we are, in the end, no wiser than we were in the beginning when making decisions about teacher education.

What are the policy and program implications for the ways in which teacher preparatory institutions within our "nation at risk" have responded to the reform movement of the early 1980s? This section of the paper explores five areas of concern to both the policy analyst and the program developer: the forces driving these reforms; the values and assumptions underlying these reforms; the manner in which these reforms have been implemented; the

problems encountered during implementation; and, the effectiveness of these reforms. This paper concludes with an assessment of the policy implications for teacher education reform.

We will argue that most reforms have resulted from purely external, political forces or agents (e.g., national reports or state legislative mandates) or some combination of these with internal forces (e.g., declining enrollments or faculty/administrator desires for change). As a result, reform efforts are less likely to receive the types of structural (e.g., financial) and personal (e.g., faculty commitment) support needed to sustain long lasting change. Consequently, they will continue to perpetuate the image of a profession which follows directions mapped out by others. The power of these external forces can be seen in the conceptual frameworks of most reform efforts (traditional, linear, cause-and-effect) and their largely piecemeal approaches -- many of which emanate directly from forces outside of the teacher education institutions. Finally, we will argue that these reforms will likely result in increased centralization of control and resources as well as a greater standardization of the curriculum in teacher education.

Forces Driving the Reform Movement

Impetus for change is not a simple matter to discern. Using our sample data, we can discuss this phenomenon most comfortably by identifying three forces from which impetus for change stems: external, internal, and some combination of these.

External forces are those which are unconnected to a specific program or program faculty and which prescribe generic reforms for

all teacher education programs. These would include national reports (e.g., *Educating a Profession*), professional reports (e.g., *A Nation Prepared*), regional and state reports (e.g., *California Commission on the Teaching Profession)*, and in certain cases, institutional reports (e.g., *Coalition of Teacher Education Programs*). To some extent, all of the reformed programs within our focus have been influenced by external forces. Evidence of this is found within the descriptions themselves. In very few cases, however, did we find programs which appeared to be responding solely to external impetus. An example are the changes taking place within the College of Education at Texas A & M University.[142] As a member of the "Holmes Group," this school's efforts have been guided largely by external (i.e., Holmes Group) directives and ideas. However, many of the concerns articulated by the Holmes Group had been discussed by this university prior to the issuance of *Tomorrow's Teachers.*

Internal forces are those arising within a particular program or institution regarding resources, students, or curricula. Grambling's efforts to strengthen its program, for example, stemmed from evidence of graduates' low National Teacher Examination scores coupled with concerns for its public image.[143] Comprehensive changes in teacher education at Bloomsburg University (Pennsylvania) evolved from the results of a faculty survey.[144] Perhaps it is not surprising that the "purest" examples of internal impetus for change are found within programs which began their reforms prior to the emergence of our post-1983 reform-saturated climate.

Most programs within our sample, however, responded to a combination of external and internal forces. The Education Division of Western Montana College, for example, developed a new teacher education program option in response to declining enrollments and a mandate from its Board of Regents to become a Rural Education Center.[145] The "transformed curriculum" at Winthrop College (South Carolina), on the other hand, resulted from its faculty's awareness of "national media and commission attacks," growth in the number of requirements from state legislation and accreditation agencies, recognition of a growing body of effective teaching research, quality of its student body, and the school's tradition of quality service.[146]

The fact that change, for the most part, was driven by external or a combination of external and internal forces poses several programmatic and policy making dilemmas.[147] External prescriptions have the power to shape our own thoughts about teacher preparation. "One unfortunate side effect of adopting these remedies is that some of the most profound problems plaguing the teaching profession remain inadequately diagnosed."[148] Broadly drawn generic prescriptions and mandates ignore the unique nature of individual programs and individual institutions and suggest that all programs are in need of the prescribed reforms.[149] Teacher preparation programs are quite diverse, and bending to powerful, overarching generic reform calls may bastardize teacher preparatory institutions.[150] Furthermore, there is evidence to suggest that no research-based criteria exist for distinguishing between effective and ineffective teacher preparation programs.[151]

David Imig[152] points out the existence of studies which "have suggested that teacher education does not warrant intervention. . .because it constitutes so little of the total education program as to have limited impact in terms of student achievement or school effectiveness." Nonetheless, we flow in the direction set largely by outsiders.

> Despite the poverty of the argument and the neglect of substantive issues, the school reform reports' call for more rigorous teacher preparation standards has attracted widespread attention and response from state departments of education, teacher education institutions, professional organizations, and teacher educators. Insofar as these reports succeed in shaping the debate about teacher education and teaching, they will also succeed in diverting reform.[153]

While it is important to identify the source of this impetus for change, it is more important to ascertain whether change is the appropriate response.[154] Reacting in whole or in part to external forces poses further problems for the nature of reformed programs as a whole as well as the extent to which such generic reforms hold meaning within the particular context in which they take place.

Reform Assumptions

By and large, the programs in our sample reflect a framework which rests on two basic assumptions: (1) that students are the same (within certification areas such as elementary or special education); and (2) that the nature of the teacher education process

is well understood. These programs, thus, are "traditional" in nature -- despite the reform garb they wear.[155]

Evidence in support of this claim is found upon inspection of the assumptions underlying these programs. Most, for example, reflected the same linear framework posited by Horace Mann some 150 years ago: (better teacher candidates -> better teacher preparation programs -> better teachers -> better schools -> better learning -> better graduates -> better teacher candidates).[156] This framework is exemplified in programs which offer incentives to "highly qualified" recruits despite a convincing collection of evidence to refute such conventional ways of screening applications.[157] Additional evidence of traditionalism is the operational assumption, "more is better," apparent in the vast majority of programs: more general and discipline-specific coursework, more field experiences, more years of study will result in better teachers.

Although teacher education faculty and administrators often must cope with legislative mandates which reflect such assumptions, their plight results in no small part from the profession's inability to significantly affect such mandates through collective action.[158] This unfortunate fact is underscored in a recent survey of AACTE institutions which identified six recommendations common to some of the most visible reform reports. One of these read: "Teacher educators must work with political leaders who influence policy in restructuring teacher education."[159] The institutions were asked to rank the six recommendations according to priority and the amount of action occurring in each area. The

recommendation cited above ranked fifth in priority and fifth in activity.

We have been *told* , for example, that the perceived weaknesses of teachers and teaching is primarily due to poor quality teacher preparation. Such global perceptions and causal links are suspect on several grounds[160]:

> One is that U.S. teachers have an average of 13 years of classroom experience;[161] many, if not most, of the teachers currently teaching are not "products" of current programs. Second, those years of classroom experience have likely had considerably more impact on what teachers do or do not do than one or two years of teacher education they experience more than a decade ago.

Surely it seems odd that teacher educators as a group would allow external forces to point out weaknesses without engaging those policy makers in such substantive dialogue.

Furthermore, external mandates need not prevent teacher preparation institutions or programs from taking a more organized, systematic and critical look inside the "black box" of teacher preparation. External pressures need not result in the further embellishment of existing traditional models but might encourage the creation of more "open" models like those found at Michigan State University[162] or "system" models like that of the University of Florida.[163]

Indeed, the present environment seems ideal for the development and implementation of "second wave" reform efforts.[164] Many share the belief of Watts[165] that such changes (e.g., the development of schools of pedagogy) would result in "profound

change" in teaching and teacher education. The conception of "professional development centers,"[166] another non-traditional reform plan, would not only enable such changes in structure but would reframe the discussion of teacher educators' work entirely.

In short, the taken-for-granted assumptions underlying most reformed teacher education programs have been strengthened, not questioned; the traditional model has become more deeply entrenched. The overall passivity of our posture, our general acceptance of an imposed framework and set of assumptions, and our largely reactive remedies have resulted in "a reform thrust driven by conservative instincts and destined further to mechanize and routinize the teaching role."[167] Instances to the contrary stand in stark contrast when seen through the light of specific areas in which reform efforts have been focused.

Implementation of Reforms

The Curry School of Education at the University of Virginia completely rebuilt its teacher education program around a "Teacher as Decision-maker" model. Working from the premise "that teachers who make appropriate, consistent, and defensible decisions will facilitate student achievement of intended learning outcomes,"[168] these reformers constructed a program containing numerous creative and pedagogically-defensible characteristics, including the integration of all courses, labs, and field requirements around focal concepts and skills. The scope of the Curry program extends from admission (during freshman or sophomore year) to induction (with a

"teacher warranty" for all who graduate and are recommended for certification).

Curry faculty took seriously the opportunity for revitalization through change. Curry, like the University of Maryland, stands as an exception within our sample. Available descriptions of teacher education program reforms typically reflect piecemeal curriculum alterations, additional field experiences (frequently with the dual purpose of serving the prospective teacher and establishing closer ties with surrounding public school personnel), and raised entrance and exit standards -- a finding paralleled in existing survey research.[169]

Weaknesses in this approach to teacher education reform can be seen more clearly in programs focused on recruitment and high admission standards. We begin with a statement reflecting the overriding belief underlying these efforts.

> Because an obvious relationship exists between the quality of the teacher education program and the quality of the students entering the program, and because society rightfully expects that the profession will seek the most qualified applicants, educators must begin to consider recruitment as a critical checkpoint and assign it a high priority.[170]

This premise resulted in recruitment becoming "an active, innovative endeavor for schools, colleges and departments of education" by 1985.[171] However, while "a plausible case can be made. . .for the wisdom of [this and other reform recommendations]. . .each can bear a further scrutiny that reveals that, as usual, matters are more complicated than they appear."[172]

Typically, recruitment efforts are grounded upon empirical data rather than the sort of elaborate process suggested by some researchers. Evidence suggests that employing data such as grade point averages alone might eliminate persons who are actually perceived to be successful future teachers.[173] Simple and relatively easy solutions to problems which are perceived as simple in themselves are seldom defensible.

Our example is intended to uncover the poverty of first wave reform calls and the resulting program changes reflected by most of the literature reviewed. Second wave reform proposals acknowledge these weaknesses.[174] Having reframed problems from linear to interactional, recommendations from these latest reforms shifted focus and recognized the complexities of teacher education change. Instead of asking how we can get "better" students into our "better" programs;

> The question. . .becomes: How can teaching as a profession attract and retain qualified and capable persons - rather than simply looking to teacher education programs to provide more of something (rigor? standards? requirements?) either to keep people out or somehow to fix them up.[175]

"In order to design a program of teacher education," according to Willis Hawley,[176] "one needs to decide what types of teachers one wants." Asking this, or any number of similarly provocative questions (e.g., "what is the nature of the role of classroom teacher?") invites lengthy and spirited struggle known to any group which has undergone substantive curriculum work. Despite the

seeming obviousness of such an approach, few post-1983 reform program descriptions that we reviewed discussed participating in such efforts. Interestingly, almost all program descriptions which recounted this type of purposeful programmatic reconceptualization were initiated prior to the reform movement of the 1980s.

This pattern of patchwork, post-*A Nation at Risk* reform efforts suggests two conclusions. First, present-day reformers are looking for high profile, "quick-fix" answers. Blue ribbon panels and newly-developed centers eclipse wholistic planning and research related to program overhaul. The AACTE's self-aggrandizing *Teacher Education Quality Initiatives Widespread*[177], for example, boasts of reform efforts at 41 teacher preparation program sites. One has to exercise considerable patience while reading about raised admission standards and recruitment incentives in order to discover a reform initiative that gives the slightest appearance of wholistic intent. The examples which follow are illustrative of this contrast[178]:

> Central Washington University, Ellensburg, Wash.: Raised admission requirements, including the scores on the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills, major and minor grade point averages, and the cumulative grade point average. Will host a symposium on ways to improve teacher preparation to guarantee that graduates from schools of education meet or surpass public expectations.
>
> University of Maine, Orono: Redesigned teacher education to emphasize liberal arts, interdisciplinary work, human development, collaborative efforts with the teaching profession, on-site experiences, recruitment, and continuous evaluation of teacher education students. Is launching a pilot program of professional preparation teams in two school districts to train freshman teacher education students.

We recognize that this publication appeared not long after *A Nation at Risk* and that we shouldn't expect to find reports of programs undergoing the kinds of encompassing reforms found at the University of Maine. Our point, however, is simply that after four years, the majority of reform descriptions which make up our sample bear a sad resemblance to the more immediate initiatives reported by AACTE in 1983.

The picture of present day reform efforts in teacher preparation, then, is somewhat less than panoramic. "Quick-fix" programs for problems identified by persons at various political levels are readily addressed. Little data exist, however, from which to evaluate the implementation of substantive teacher education reforms. There is, in contrast, a research base that seriously questions the efficacy of such "quick-fix" reforms.[179]

Problems in Implementation

Money, resources, time, external mandates (which change all too frequently), and participant commitment are among those common problems encountered during implementation of any type of curricular change. However, a review of the reformed program descriptions would suggest to the uninitiated that such problems are rare. Program descriptions reviewed in this study, for example, too easily claimed that they adopted policies for recruiting "better" students and discussed the ways in which they went about this. Few in our sample described problems such as uncooperative high school

counselors, the need to pay special attention to minority recruits, regulatory barriers, or the lack of faculty support.[180]

This situation exists, in part, because of the cause-and-effect assumptions of those adopting reforms. As explained in the previous section, faculty which adopt a "piece" of reform (e.g., raised admission standards) may expect certain results without ever needing to develop an understanding of its problematics or without engaging in discourse with other faculty members. The revision of professional education courses to reflect the knowledge base for teaching is another case in point. We are not without our own scholars who are able to identify the areas of pedagogy to which this knowledge base pertains.[181] However, the conviction that such a knowledge base (or bases) exists because of a desire, on the part of educational researchers, to create a science of education is dubious.[182] The particular paradigm in which this view resides and the set of assumptions it reflects cannot remain taken-for-granted in the quest for meaningful reform. Nevertheless, despite the fact that we have not yet reached agreement on this particular body of knowledge, some institutions already have begun plugging findings from the "knowledge base" into their professional education curriculum. Quick fixes are superficial fixes.

The National Institute of Education's "Preservice Teacher Education Improvement Project" which was designed to produce change (improvement) in programs through the use of such research information, is a good illustration of the barriers encountered.[183] "The intent was to make this research information available to . . .10 colleges and universities, discuss it with them, and assist them to

use it in their programs for preparing teachers."[184] The project took place between 1983-1984 and each participating institution received about $1,300 to assist with its expenses. In an invited review of this project, another researcher wrote: "Predictably, only meager evidence can be found to support realization of [the above intent]."[185] Judith Lanier goes on to explain some of the problems with this particular study (e.g., too little time and money) and with the above-mentioned intention itself. Recognizing that the importance of research knowledge can be inflated and used for the wrong reasons, her concluding comment speaks eloquently to the example we cite here:

> The illusion that we can improve teacher education by inserting research "facts" into an already desultory curriculum is only the most recent fad that promises to bring legitimacy to a troubled field. Improvements will require significant investments of time, thought, and talent.[186]

Another example of a problem related to the oft-cited intention of bettering teacher education programs through the inclusion of research knowledge into professional education curricula is described in a study conducted by Anderson.[187] Comparisons were made between five teacher education program development teams "to investigate one common claim regarding the usefulness of educational literature: that this documented knowledge should be useful for improving practice in fields such as teacher education."[188] The results suggest that this particular reform ideal is more illusory than apparent. Research results

pertaining to our "knowledge base" were mentioned in less than 1 per cent of the recorded discussions of any team; members rarely asked questions answerable by an appeal to research, and discussions of codified knowledge were rarely associated with curriculum inquiry.

Anyone with a sincere desire to both learn *about* and *from* teacher education program reforms approaches the literature with the hope of being informed about the problems associated with such activities. Fewer than one fourth of the program reform accounts we reviewed, however, contained such information. Moreover, what is worthy of note is that practically all of the problems mentioned related to internal, institutional concerns.

One scholar provides us with a thoughtful and convincing analysis of the problematic aspects of institutional reform. Institutions drive practices, Reid[189] argues, and institutional inertia results from the need to maintain equilibrium between its social system, technology, and theory. Reform attempts which alter any of these aspects without recognizing the need to create a new equilibrium are likely to fail, in the long run, as the institution seeks to reestablish its former configuration of equilibrium.

Evidence of such problems exists within our sample. Problems arose at the University of Kansas: "When the decisions began to infringe on established territories, when courses were to be deleted or modified, the resistance to change stiffened. . .some faculty members are extremely reluctant to change anything at all.[190]

Similar problems were faced at the University of Maryland and characterized as "the classic struggle between change agents [in this case, faculty involved with program reform] and power brokers

[in this case, the department chair-person and other faculty]."[191] At Maryland, at least, such conflict and resistance is acknowledged and continues to be resolved as specific issues arise. Problems of this sort also were anticipated by the reformers at the University of South Carolina and circumvented by a combination of initial faculty and administrative commitment and a set of prescribed planning and implementation parameters.[192]

The most thorough and informative description of reform-related problems is provided in a description of the University of Florida's SCATT program.[193] College faculty and school supervisors have not been eager to develop the flexible schedules needed by SCATT interns, and the efforts of SCATT faculty to have the program accepted as an alternative program or special series of courses within the college have been mired in a labyrinth of committees. SCATT faculty also realize that the enormous amounts of time and energy they put into this program are not recognized in their conventional merit review structure and, in fact, take away from those categories which are (e.g., research). SCATT faculty, too, see these and other problems (e.g., certain faculty feeling left out or resenting the program for skimming top students from the traditional programs) as ongoing in nature.

In the final analysis we come away from our review with the sense that program reform is relatively easy to accomplish. Given enough time and the commitment of a cadre of change agents or a strong and charismatic leader, reform efforts appear to be a matter of thorough planning and implementation with the recognition that internal problems occasionally arise along the reform path.

Reform Effectiveness

In the midst of a major reform movement with frenzied activity, we are reminded of our apparent ignorance of past lessons taught.[194] Surely all could benefit from a knowledge and understanding of research findings from present and past efforts. This is certainly the consensus of some of the most prominent spokes-persons for teacher education reform:

> Five-year and alternative certification programs should be tested and closely monitored and evaluated. Otherwise, at the end of the experiment no one will know whether different ways of preparing teachers make a difference in student learning.[195]

> Further support of research and development efforts to improve preservice teacher education are clearly needed. Given the state of the field, however, the most beneficial way to begin such efforts is with sound descriptive research, as opposed to experimental work. An important guiding principle for the descriptive work would be to focus on studies of exemplary programs, rather than on representative programs only. . . . The key is to build on exemplary practice.[196]

> This study indicates that educational leaders support many of the recommendations of the major reports and that much activity in the areas already exists. However, before any recommendations from any source are adopted and instituted by the profession, what is being done in the area and how it is being done should be researched. Much can be learned from those teacher education programs that already are involved in the recommended activities.[197]

Unfortunately, after careful review of our program descriptions, we conclude that few of these recommendations have

been heeded. We, therefore, are at a loss to formulate any set of findings or principles based upon the efficacy of recent teacher education reform efforts.

More than half of the reformed program descriptions spoke of the importance of ongoing evaluation as a component of the newly-revised agenda.[198] Very few, however, reported any set of systematic, data-based findings. While we recognize that in some cases such data may not be available for analysis and reporting for some time to come, the virtual absence of existing reports documenting the efficacy of recent reform efforts is alarming.

There are some exceptions. One study[199] reports findings of participants in traditional and alternative teacher preparation programs. Three groups, graduates from a regular four-year program, graduates from a fifth-year program (referred to as postbaccalaureates), and graduates from a special fifth-year program for "academically talented graduates of liberal arts colleges" (referred to as Lyndhurst students) were compared to assess program efficacy. Although their undergraduate grade point averages (GPA) were similar, the Lyndhurst students scored better than the other groups on NTE tests of general and professional knowledge. About one third of the school personnel who worked with students reported that the Lyndhurst students were academically better prepared than those in the other two groups, while more than half judged them to be more equal.[200]

In a study conducted at Colorado State University, researchers noted that the only significant difference between student teachers identified as highly successful and those least successful was their

performance in pedagogical (professional education) courses. In their words:

> It would appear that as the content of coursework more closely relates to the knowledge and skills required in teaching, performance in that coursework can more readily predict success in student teaching and subsequently (it is assumed) in teaching.[201]

Some data do exist relative to the frequently-mentioned reform area of establishing better working relationships with personnel from public schools. This particular reform is a part of CoTEEP, a program operated by the Virginia Commonwealth University and the Richmond Public Schools.[202] University educators and public school educators completed a Teacher Knowledge and Beliefs Inventory (TKBI) designed to determine generic crucial and very important professional knowledge and educational beliefs. The authors' conclusions lend hope to intentions for program reforms which would include significant involvement of public school personnel in the redesign of professional curricula:

> Based on the results of this study, it appears that collaborative preservice teacher objectives would consist of primarily professional knowledge and a few selected educational beliefs. Consensus exists on the importance of applied knowledge. In addition, university educators would emphasize general or theoretical knowledge and school educators would emphasize practical (particularistic) knowledge.[203]

Some semblance of a collective picture comparing students in conventional and reformed programs can be drawn. Data pertaining to the substitute-teacher interns in the Bridgeport program[204] were

gathered from the interns, their school principals, and university faculty. "Regular" substitute teachers, student teachers, and apprentice teachers were compared with the interns on pre and post measures of their image of "self as teacher." These three groups, which were significantly lower on this measure at the outset of the program, were not significantly different at its conclusion. School personnel and university faculty noted this change as predominant in the interns. Additionally, interns were perceived to be significantly more effective in classrooms across post-test results.

In a similar comparative study of "regular" education majors enrolled in an alternative certification program at Texas Tech,[205] no significant differences in either supervisor ratings or self-report moral ratings appeared. Based upon pupil cognitive attainment data, education majors scores 10 percent higher on measures of teaching performance. This finding supports the conclusion of the Colorado State researchers relative to the importance of professional education coursework.

Finally, we look at yet another study comparing "regular" student teachers from four year and fifth-year programs at the University of Tennessee at Knoxville with the Lyndhurst fellows.[206] While the academically talented Lyndhurst recruits significantly outscored the members of the other groups on the National Teacher Examination General Knowledge Test, responses from school superintendents, principals, and teacher/mentors were <u>not</u> suggestive of the student teaching superiority of Lyndhurst fellows over traditionally prepared teachers.

Much as we tried, we were largely unable to draw a clear picture of the efficacy of these first wave reform efforts. Most descriptions contain no reference to data pertinent to program efficacy and those which do often speak of percentages of graduates who have jobs or impressionistic data gathered from program participants.[207] Questions and answers about "what works" will have to wait, it seems, until after this reform movement has crested.

Policy and Program Implications of the Reform Movement

By mid-decade, Florida had enacted so much education-related legislation that a request was sent to the senate for a moratorium on any new mandates until implementation of those already passed had been accomplished. This current spate of educational reform proposals is not surprising to those who remember or who have studied the reforms of past generations. On the basis of prior attempts to reform education programs and policies, what are the policy implications for this latest reform wave?

Although the reforms have come from 50 separate states, they reflect a nearly singular vision of teacher education reform.[208] Despite the rhetoric of the Reagan administration about decentralization and state control, the federal government has assumed the primary responsibility for identifying educational interests and in motivating state policy makers to action. These reforms may result in increased centralization of control and resources as well as a greater standardization of the curriculum at

all levels of schooling.[209] The implications of this centralization for the teaching profession is articulated well by Gary Sykes:

> Today the rallying cry has shifted from equity to excellence, and the action from the federal to the state and local levels, but the regulatory impulse has not slackened. The new policy instruments include course mandates and planning requirements, detailed curricular specifications, increased student and teacher testing, and teacher evaluation systems that purport to be research-based. In many states and localities, the results have been increased paper-work, teaching to the test, and teaching to behaviors specified by the evaluation system The emphasis, in short, is on external accountability, not professional responsibility.[210]

The implications for this centralization on the lives of children in school also has been the concern of scholars:

> The Jeffersonian concern that democratic participation in the Republic's affairs rests on the broadest enlightenment of the people's intellect appears to have little chance of influencing the direction of current reform efforts. Rather, these reforms appear destined to lead to greater control over childrens' lives by the state and its linked corporate and financial sectors, which, in the interest of economic productivity and in the name of efficiency, will attempt to evolve a more technocratically sophisticated and hyper-rationalized school system.[211]

Articulating a more moderate position, Philip Schechty states, "I think a central push is needed all the time. But what should be centralized and what should be decentralized is probably the most critical policy question legislators confront."[212]

A second important implication relates to the assumptions of these reforms. They assume that professionally controlled factors such as the recruitment of high-ability students, more rigorous curriculum offerings, and routine testing, will facilitate student success in the classroom and, more importantly, result in higher productivity in the workplace: The relationship between student success and existing social structures which reflect and reproduce differential educational opportunities and expectations on the basis of gender, social class, and race is simply not acknowledged.[213] Additionally, "there is little concern with how public education could better serve the interests of diverse groups of students by enabling them to understand and gain some control over the socio-political forces that influence their destinies."[214] The goal is to foster industrial discipline and cultural uniformity.[215] Consequently, as another scholar observed, these "reforms in no way attempt to alter the fundamental nature of the curriculum, pedagogy, and institutional structure typically found in American schools. Perhaps more than anything, what they want is more of what already exists, rather than something profoundly different."[216]

Masked in the rhetoric of the reform proposals about the need for highly skilled workers within the new information-based society is a more stratified school system. One the one hand, classrooms of accelerated students taught by high-ability, newly recruited teachers in well-refurbished suburban schools. On the other hand, vocational preparation of students, many living within inner city areas, in collaboration with business and industry for

the occupations expected to generate most new jobs during the next few years: janitors, nurses' aids, sales clerks, cashiers, waiters & waitresses.[217]

If these "dark and shadowed times" come to pass, then it will be because our institutional responses were "ordinarily technical." That is, these reforms and their advocates chose, as Greene continues,[218] "to think mainly in terms of techniques or cures or remedies. . .to render others and the earth itself as objects to be acted upon, treated, controlled, or used."

Judith Lanier[219] has aptly recognized that "Teacher education suffers in general from the illusion that great things can be obtained with minor investments of time and resources." Our analysis leads us to the obvious conclusion that some of our own time and professional resources ought to be channeled into the creation of a knowledge base *of* teacher education. Efforts in this general direction have already begun. The American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education[220] has initiated a Member Program Information System (MPIS) in data base form to enable inquirers to discover "who is doing what" with respect to program reform efforts. However, most of these reported programs self-evaluate using course ratings and graduate follow-ups. Fewer than half collect data from employers or university faculty, only 19 percent use external review committees, and less than one in four collect "other kinds of program evaluation data." The likelihood that MPIS will provide a substantive understanding of teacher education reform is slim. This same organization, through its Committee on Research and Information, has established a second data base, Research About

Teacher Education (RATE). Perhaps this project will fare better in "documenting the success of reforms and in stimulating improvements."[221]

The idea of using a data base for the organization and dissemination of teacher education program information, especially with regard to evaluative data, is an exciting but elusive goal. Precedent actions, of course, would have to take place within schools, colleges and departments of education themselves. In addition to systematic descriptions of programs, each institution with a teacher education program "should establish and maintain mechanisms for studying their programs and acquiring information about the studies of others related to teacher education."[222] In the words of Fenstermacher, "It is time that the application of and utilization of knowledge become as much a problem for research and scholarship as the generation and production of knowledge has been."[223] In the case of teacher education reform, the problems of knowledge generation and production have yet to be resolved.

Such a data base will have to reflect a very different sort of research, however. Data must come from reformed programs that (1) reflect wholistic change, (2) acknowledge the multitude of interrelated complexities inherent in teacher preparation and classroom teaching, (3) succeed in establishing a new institutional equilibrium, and (4) use multiple sources of evaluative data, preferably collected by both internal and external researchers. William Reid notes that such "educational reforms would do well to ally themselves with this trend [toward a new emphasis on "virtuous" reform]." He posits this argument,

> Not in the extravagant expectation that it can become a general prescription for change, but in order that as many and as varied examples of good practice as possible can be in operation when the social, political, or technological imperatives for fundamental renewal come upon us, as they assuredly will.[224]

A professional dream of this magnitude would allow us to seek broader visions[225] and narrower aspects[226] of programs which reflect critical recognitions of the magnificent complexity of becoming a teacher. A professional vision of this scope would require coordination and collaboration among our largest professional organizations (e.g, AACTE, ATE) and the teacher education subdivisions of other professional groups (e.g., AERA, ASCD). A professional commitment of this enormity would suggest, among other things, that we -- as teacher educators -- intend to open our own Pandora's Box and seek to root our own work in critical and thoughtful action. We confront this challenge together; we must decide collectively how to proceed.

---

1 Bill Honig, California State Superintendent of Education (Pipho, 1984:85).

2 Florio, 1986:216.

3 Carnegie Corporation, 1983; Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; Education for Economic Security Act, 1984; Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board, 1986; National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983; National Science Board Commission, 1982; New York State Board of Regents, 1983; Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, 1983; Task Force of the Business-Higher Education Forum, 1983; Twentieth Century Fund, 1983. For a critical analysis of the responsibility of educational institutions to meet the nation's economic needs and many of the questionable assumptions assumed within these reports, see: Altbach, 1985; Apple, 1985, Berman, 1985; Cohen, 1984; Duckworth, 1984; Feinberg, 1987; Giroux, 1984; Grant & Sleeter, 1985; Lasch, 1985; Nash & Ducharme, 1983; Pink, 1986; Shapiro, 1985a; Spring, 1985.

[4] Pigge, 1985; Roberson, Keith, & Page, 1983; Sykes, 1983; Vance & Schlechty, 1982; Weaver, 1983;

[5] Education Week, 1985; Goertz & Pitcher, 1985. Some of the reports issued during this period include: California Commission on the Teaching Profession, 1985; External Review Committee for the Improvement of Teacher Education in Georgia, 1986; Georgia State Department of Education, 1984; Illinois Commission on the Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Education, 1984; Maryland Commission on Quality Teachers, 1982; New York State Education Department, 1986; Ohio Commission on Educational Excellence, 1983; Michigan Governor's Office, 1984; Minnesota Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education, 1985; For state profiles of reform progress, see: American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education, 1985; Goertz, Ekstrom, & Coley, 1984.

[6] Cross, 1984; Robinson, 1985.

[7] National Educational Association, 1986. For a summary of how states have financed educational reform, see: Odden, 1986.

[8] Among the more influential reports were: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1983; American Federation of Teachers, 1986; Boyer, 1983; California Commission on the Teaching Profession, 1985; Feistritzer, 1983; 1984; Galambos, 1985; Governor's Educational Review Commission, 1984; Holmes Group, 1986; Howsam, Corrigan, Denemark, & Nash, 1985; Intergovernmental Advisory Council on Education, 1985; National Educational Association, 1982; National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education, 1985; National Educational Association, 1985; National Governors' Association, 1986; Southern Regional Educational Board, 1981; Southern Regional Educational Board, 1985; Task Force for the Review of Public Education, 1982; Task Force on Higher Education and the School, 1983. For a summary of one or more of these reform reports, see: Case, Lanier & Miskel, 1986; Chronicle of Higher Education, 1986; Crabtree & Geiger, 1983; Darling-Hammond, 1984; Egbert, 1985; Fisher & Feldman, 1985; Guyton, 1987; Harvard Educational Review, 1984; Keppel, 1986; Meade, 1984; Murray, 1986; Sikula & Roth, 1984; Southern Educational Regional Board, 1986. For a critical review of some of these reports, consult: Berman, 1985; Combleth, 1986; Edson, 1984; Feinberg, 1983; Finkelstein, 1984; Gideonse, 1984; Howe, 1984; Passow, 1984; Popkewitz & Pitman, 1986; Sokolow, 1983; Stedman & Smith, 1983; Tetreault & Schumck, 1985; Tom, 1986; Weiss, 1985; Zeichner, 1986.

[9] Excluded from this discussion are reports generated from academic studies (e.g., Lightfoot, 1983; Goodlad, 1983), and policies which do not fall within the province of teacher education institutions (e.g., career ladders, merit pay).

[10] Bell, 1981:2.

[11] Brunner, 1983:7

[12] Egbert, 1980:7. At the beginning of the decade other persons associated with teacher education were also beginning to articulate this neo-conservative conception of excellence. See, for example, Brown, 1981; Dolce, 1981; United States Congress, 1981.

[13] There are several meanings to the words "excellence" and "competence." These range from the technical (acquiring and exemplifying a proficiency) to the social (satisfaction of individual goals in the context of the civic community). These differing conceptions dramatically effect the

development, implementation, and evaluation of educational policy. For a discussion of the meanings of "excellence" or "competence", see: DeYoung, 1986; Duke, 1985; Green, 1983; Greene, 1984a; 1984b; 1984c; Newmann & Kelly, 1985; Prakash & Waks, 1985; Raywid, 1987; Short, 1984; 1985. In a recent review of states in which teacher testing is being conducted, Yoder & Janini (1987), have also found various operational definitions of competence revealed in the skills tested, the level of difficulty provided, and the proficiency expected.

[14] Pipho, 1984.

[15] Anrig, 1986; Galambos, 1986; Kearns, 1984. Not until this decade did any state outside of the southeast require standardized testing for teacher certification.

[16] Anrig, 1986; Flippo, 1985; Goertz, Ekstrom & Coley, 1984; Hood & Parker, 1986; Leach & Solomon, 1984; Sandefur, 1985. For a discussion of the complexities of developing state examinations, see: Salman, 1981. For the most recent authoritative review of teacher testing and trends in state legislative educational reform, see: Darling-Hammond & Berry, in press; Harvey, Madaus & Kreitzer, 1987.

[17] Interestingly, in Florida, three fourths of those graduates who have taken the state certification examination consider it easy, about half believe it should be more rigorous, and one-third view it as an inadequate measure of minimum competency (Villeme & Hall, 1985). For a review of how various states have implemented competency testing and performance evaluation of teacher candidates, see: Darling-Hammond & Berry, in press; Ishler, 1985; Mendoza & Kossack, 1981; Shepherd & Kreitzer, 1987; Stanard, 1985. For an overview of the legal issues associated with this approach, see: Hammes, 1985.

[18] For an elaboration of the weaknesses discussed, see: Anrig, 1985; Arciniega, 1985; Bell & Morskink, 1986; Bruno & Marcoulides, 1985; Galambos, 1986; Goertz, Ekstrom & Coley, 1984; Goertz & Pitcher, 1985; Graham, 1987; Madus & Pullin, 1987; McDaniel, 1986; Medley, 1984; Mercer, 1984; Petrie, 1985; Salagnir, 1985; Sandefur, 1984; Smith, 1984; Yoder & Janini, 1987. The raising of standards, in the absence of any other structural changes in the school curriculum, will have a significant impact on at risk school populations. See, for example: McDill, Natriello & Pallas, 1986.

[19] Kauchak, 1984.

[20] McNett, 1983; Garcia, 1985; National Center for Educational Statistics, 1983. For a further discussion of the plight of minority teachers, see: Haberman, 1984; Reed, 1986; Tewel & Trubowitz, 1987; Wilson, 1986; Witty, 1980; 1982. Currently, ETS, in collaboration with the Southern Regional Education Board is conducting "testwiseness programs" in several traditionally black colleges in South Carolina, Louisiana, and Maryland (Bell & Morskink, 1986). Examining the impact of these reforms on issues regarding equity has not been a priority in most states (American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 1985). An exception to this is a recently released document from California (California State Postsecondary Commission, 1986). For a review of the problems faced by minority students in higher education, see: Graham, 1987; Kortokrax-Clark, 1986-87; Nelms, 1982. Also, see the recent special issue of Negro Education Review, 38(2) on the testing of African-American students, and a proposal for the increase of minority students in teaching while supporting competency standards (Gifford, 1986).

[21] Barth, 1986. For a good example of this type of approach in teacher reform within North Carolina, see: Knight, 1981.

[22] Cross, 1987. For a useful discussion of the need to consider context and persons in teacher assessment, see: Haroutunian-Gordon, 1987.

[23] Oklahoma State Department of Education, 1981.

[24] For an overview of beginning teacher induction programs not directly associated with a higher education institution, see: Brouillet, 1987; Hawk, 1986-87; Morales, 1983; Thies-Sprinthall, 1986. For an interesting descriptive article on the political process for enacting a state-wide internship, see: Kunkel & Dearmin, 1981.

[25] Saunders, 1986.

[26] American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education, 1985.

[27] For a description of such programs see, for example: Cooperman & Klagholz, 1985; Culver, Eicher & Sacks, 1986; Georgia State Department of Education, 1984; Oliver & McKibbin, 1985.

[28] Petrie, 1985:235. For similar arguments against alternative certification which bypasses teacher education institutions, see: Hazlett, 1984; Smith, 1986.

[29] Spero, 1986. The federal government, through the Education for Economic Security Act (PL 98-377) provides for "Congressional Merit Scholarships" for prospective mathematics and science teachers. The Talented Teachers Act of 1984 also provides scholarship incentives to prospective teachers.

[30] For further elaboration of this assumption and its implications for teacher preparation and educational quality, see: Marshall, Sears & Otis-Wilborn, 1988.

[31] These include: The Commonwealth Teacher Training Study (Charters & Waples, 1929); the National Survey of the Education of Teachers (Cooper, 1932); the reports issued by the National Society of Colleges of Teacher Educators (1935; Harap, 1951); the several national conferences sponsored by the Commission on Teacher Education on through the National Council on Education (Armstrong, et al., 1944); the more recent conferences sponsored by the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards under the auspices of the National Educational Association (Stinnett, 1955; Hodenfield & Stinnett, 1961); Lindsay, 1961; Lortie, 1966; Sarason, et al., 1967); as well as the conferences sponsored by the Fund for the Advancement of Education (Smith, 1962), and the Rochester Conference on the Implications of Research Relating to Teaching (Corrigan, 1967); the reports issued by the Carnegie Commission of Higher Education (Bagley & Learned, 1920; Learned & Wood, 1938), as well as others (e.g., Stiles, et al., 1960; Study Commission, 1976; Trout, 1943). For a historical review of some of these reports, see: Keith, 1987.

[32] There are, of course, notable exceptions to this. The Teacher Corps program, for example, initiated in 1965, has a long history and has been extensively evaluated (Bush & Bock, 1982). For a discussion of this and other teacher education reforms developed at the federal level, see: Royster & Chernay, 1981.

[33] Keesbury, 1984:217. For similar arguments, see: Berman, 1985; Jackson, 1983; Lazerson, McLaughlin & McPherson, 1984; Sykes, 1984.

[34] Tesconi, 1984. For an elaboration of this cyclical pattern of educational reform and the basic patterns of influence and policy, see: Bush, 1987; Cuban,

1988; Kaestle, 1985; Kellams, 1985; Keesbury, 1984; Kirst & Garms, 1980; Lazerson, McLaughlin & McPherson, 1985; Mertens & Yarger, 1982; Warren, 1985. For a review of alternative state-level policy mechanisms employed to achieve various educational goals during the twentieth century, see: Mitchell & Encarnation, 1984.

35 Cross, 1984; Katz, 1980.

36 Wildavsky, 1981:5.

37 Katz, 1980.

38 Gideonse, 1984; Rowls & Hanes, 1982.

39 Bacharach, Bauer & Shedd, 1986:241.

40 For an informative discussion of the process and politics of this group and its agenda, see: Olson, 1987.

41 Holmes Group, 1986. Consortia of state or private colleges have also formed their own groups to study and make recommendations regarding teacher education in their state. See, for example: Coalition of Teacher Education Programs, 1986; Kimball, 1986; Kluender, 1984a.

42 Hawley, 1986; King, 1985; Nussel, 1986; Prakash, 1986; Sikula, 1986.

43 Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986.

44 Ducharme, 1986; Keppel, 1986; Sikula, 1986; Soder, 1986.

45 National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education, 1985.

46 Prakash, 1986.

47 Howsman, Corrigan, Denemark & Nash, 1985: 204.

48 Haberman, 1986:45..

49 These journals are: Action in Teacher Education, American Educational Research Journal, American Journal of Education, Anthropology and Education Quarterly, British Journal of Educational Studies, The Clearing House, Comparative Education, Contemporary Education, Curriculum Inquiry, Delta Kappa Gamma, Educational Forum, Educational Research, Educational Researcher, Educational Review, Educational Studies, Educational Theory, Harvard Educational Review, Interchange, High School Journal, Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, Journal of Education, Journal of Moral Education, Journal of Negro Education, Journal of Teacher Education, Kappa Delta Pi Record, NEA Today, Negro Education Review, Palmetto Administrator, Phi Delta Kappan, Review of Educational Research, Sociology of Education, Sociology of Education Abstracts, Teachers College Record, The Teacher Educator, Theory into Practice, Urban Education, Urban Review.

50 A variety of teacher preparation programs were already undergoing structural reform prior to the issuance of the first wave of reform reports.

51 This number reflects several cases in which multiple types of program reforms were described (e.g., Corrigan, 1986), in the same article and thus "counted" as one institution. Where different programs at a single institution were discussed in separate articles (e.g., Hawisher [1985] writing about a revised program and Graham and Million [1986] discussing an alternative certification program, both occurring at Winthrop College), each is reflected in the total number of programs reviewed.

52 Mann, Hines, Swarzman, Roth, & Homan, 1986; Roth, Swarzmann Hines & Mann, 1985-86.

53 Scannell & Guenther, 1984.

54 Andrew, 1981; 1984.

55 Boser, Wiley & Pettibone, 1986; Saunders & Smith, 1986; Wiley, 1986; Wisiniewski, 1986.

56 Marshall, Sears, Fulton & Otis-Wilborn, 1987; Marshall & Moyer, 1987; Sears, Otis-Wilborn & Marshal, 1987.

57 Evans, King & Landers, 1986.

58 Kortokrax-Clark, 1986-87.

59 Evans, King & Landers, 1986.

60 Wilson, 1986.

61 In his survey of AACTE member institutions, Adams (1983) found that a majority had initiated or were planing to initiate change of basic skills entry or exist standards. Interestingly, few institutions reported an interest in affective or attitudinal student indicators. Also, private institutions were least likely to use screening devices or standardized tests for either graduation or certification (AACTE, 1984).

62 Brenner, Cagle, Butefish & George, 1985; Hawisher, 1985; Wheeler, 1983.

63 Benner, George & Cagle, 1987; Wisnieweski, 1986.

64 Mercer, 1984.

65 Kortokrax-Clark, 1986-87.

66 Hopfengardner, Lasley, & Joseph, 1983.

67 Hechinger, 1986-87.

68 George, 1985; Graham, 1987; Hatton, 1988; Kortokrax-Clark, 1986-87; Lacetti, 1986; Marshall, Sears & Otis-Wilborn, 1988; Mercer, 1984; Nelms, 1982; Sears, Marshall & Otis-Wilborn, 1988; Spero, 1986.

69 Perry, Kristo, & Rog, 1984

70 Schenkat, Battaglini, & Rosen, 1985

71 See, for example: Dudley & Helger, 1983; Freeman, 1985; Scannel, 1984; Smith, 1982.

72 Smith, 1982:3.

73 Brenner, Cagle, Butefish & George, 1985; Burch & James, 1985; Marshall & Moyer, 1987.

74 Moore, 1986.

75 Radck & Bixler, 1983.

76 Corrigan, 1986.

77 Hanes, Kemper, & Mulhern 1986:26-27. See also, Swick, Rowls, & Kuhs, 1984.

78 Burch & James, 1985.

79 Ashton & Crocker, 1987; Murray, 1986.

80 Evans, King & Landers, 1986. A similar program, implemented in 1983, is at the University of West Florida (AACTE, 1985).

81 Soares, 1986.

82 Boser, Wiley & Pettibone, 1986.

83 Graham & Million, 1986.

84 Boser, Wiley & Pettibone, 1986.

85 McCaleb, Borko, Arends, Garner & Mauro, 1987.

86 Corrigan, 1986:15.

87 Graham & Million, 1986.

88 Roth, 1986; Watts, 1986; Wisniewski, 1986.

89 Burch & James, 1985:1

90 Burch & James, 1985.

91 Wheeler, 1986; Southeast Missouri State, 1986.

92 Rodman, 1985.

93 For a discussion of the history, problems and benefits of teacher warranties, see: Schalock, 1987.

94 Antonelli, 1985; Barr, 1985; 1986; 1987

95 Moore, Cooper, Callahan, Comfort, Covert, Crook, Espositio, Kelly & Richardson, 1986.

96 American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1985.

97 Saunders, 1986.

98 Swick, Rowls & Kuhs, 1984:4. For a brief historical account of the events which precipitated the design of this new program, see: Mulhern, 1985.

99 Beyer, 1984.

100 Lahren, 1983.

101 Putbrese, 1984.

102 Smith, 1982; Smith, 1984; Smith & Wilson, 1984.

103 Smith, 1984:3.

104 These goals, of course, are not new. The University of Utah, for example, through its professional development centers, extensively involved school districts in the professional preparation of teachers and assists in inservice education (Holt & Peterson, 1981).

105 Bliss, Evans & Shaw, 1986: 52. For a similar program at Denison College, see: Hansgen, 1983. At the state level, Tennessee has required all "education faculty" to be in the schools at some capacity (Saunders, 1984).

106 Hawisher, 1985.

107 Buttery, Henson, Ingram & Smith, 1985-86.

108 Schumacher, Esham, & Bauer, 1985.

109 Soares, 1986.

110 Clark & Fischetti, 1987.

111 Goodlad, 1986; Hilbert, 1982.

112 One of the most well-known and well-researched extended program, initiated prior to the reform movement, is that of the University of New Hampshire. For more information, see: Andrew, 1981; 1984; 1986.

113 For an elaboration of the variety of structured models for extended programs, see: Worrest, Russell, Levy, Chance & Mertens, 1983.

114 At the time this study was being conducted, a number of institutions, such as the University of Tennessee at Knoxville, are planning to implement extended teacher education programs within the next two years.

115 Smith, 1984.

116 Murray, 1982; Scannel & Guenther, 1981; Scannel, 1984.

117 Given the interest in teacher induction and prior research into the socialization of new teachers, it is not surprising that research into this area is more developed. See, for example: Combs, 1985; Hoffman, Edward,

Pouwlissen, O'Neal, & Barnes, 1985; Elsner, 1984; Huling-Austin, Putman & Galvez-Hjornevik, 1986; Robards & Hanson, 1985; Shepherd & Gallaher, 1985. For a review of some of the earlier programs and research into teacher induction, see: Galvez-Hjornevik, 1986; Griffin, 1985; Varah, Theune, & Parker, 1986..

118 Friske & Combs, 1986. For a review and preliminary data from the Florida Beginning Teacher Program, see: Smith & Wilson, 1984.

119 Hitz & Roper, 1986; McEvoy & Morehead, 1986-87; Hegler & Dudley, 1987.

120 Perry, Kristo & Rog, 1984; Pooler, 1984.

121 Smith, 1980.

122 Freeman, 1985.

123 Burch & James, 1985.

124 Dudley & Helger, 1983.

125 McCaleb, Borko, Arends, Garner & Mauro, 1987.

126 Corrigan, 1986:14.

127 Corrigan, 1986: 14-15.

128 Denemark & Nutter, 1984; Imig, 1983.

129 American Association of State Colleges & Universities, 1986; Armstrong, Savage & Erion, 1986; Gallegos, 1981; Hatton, 1988; Monahan, 1986; Southern Regional Educational Board, 1986.

130 Some institutions, like former Holmes Group member Indiana University, have refused to dismantle their four-year undergraduate program. (Mehlinger, 1986).

131 Gross, 1984:168.

132 Evertson, Hawley, & Zlotnik, 1984:3.

133 Gideonse, 1984:208.

134 Hall, Hoffman & Doyle, 1986:19.

135 Roth, 1984.

136 Mackey, 1977; Pollock, 1983.

137 Katz, Raths, Mohanty, Kurachi & Irving, 1981; Smith, 1979.

138 The interpretive section of this paper reflects a systematically acquired and analyzed data base of program descriptions implementing teacher education reform. The collection of programs described in the previous section represented only a sample of those reformed teacher education programs which were reviewed for this study. Many of those involved in implementing reform programs simply have not written about them, as the nomination of 83 programs for national recognition of the AASCU (1986) "Showcase for Excellence," suggests. We acknowledge the likelihood that some programs described in the professional literature between 1980 and 1987 were overlooked despite our own best efforts and those of the librarians who assisted us with electronic and manual searches. We further recognize that any number of second wave reform changes may only now be getting underway -- their proponents more likely to be working at than writing about reform. The extent to which they are subject to critique for insufficient information only heightens our growing professional awareness of the importance of dissemination. Finally, we acknowledge the distinction between evaluation of on-going programs for institutional use and research into teacher education programs for dissemination in the

educational research community. The former, as Adams & Craig (1983), underscore in their survey of teacher preparatory institutions, occurs much more frequently than might be suggested by a review of ERIC and other reference sources.

139 Chance, 1987.

140 For an insightful discussion of the value and limitations of research knowledge in teacher education and the importance of other forms of knowledge in arriving at practical decisions, see: Buchmann, 1984; Tom, 1980.

141 Fairweather, Tornatzky, Fergus & Avellar, 1982.

142 Corrigan, 1986.

143 Teacher education improvement, 1986.

144 Planning for change, 1984.

145 Lahren, 1983.

146 Hawisher, 1985.

147 This finding corresponds with that of an earlier survey (Adams, 1983) which found that the most influential agency in promoting change in AACTE member institutions was the state department of education.

148 Rosenholtz, 1985:35.

149 Imig, 1985; Kowalski, 1985.

150 Kluender, 1984b; Monahan, 1986.

151 Evertson, Hawley & Zlotnik, 1984.

152 Imig, 1985b: 144-145.

153 Combleth, 1986:7.

154 Daly, 1985.

155 Anglin, Fox & DeVault, 1981.

156 Keith, 1987.

157 See, for example: Boser, Wiley and Pettibone, 1986.; Evertson, Hawley & Zlotnik, 1984; Sears, Marshall & Moyer, 1985; Marshall, Sears, Otis-Wilborn, 1986.

158 Imig, 1985.

159 Guyton and Antonelli, 1987: 45.

160 Combleth, 1986:6.

161 Hacker, 1984.

162 Anderson, 1982.

163 Smith, 1984.

164 See, for example, those suggested a decade earlier by Howsam, Corrigan, Denemark, & Nash, 1985 (reprint of 1976 report).

165 Watts, 1986.

166 Hawley, 1987. See, also: Combleth, 1986.

167 Romanish, 1987:9.

168 Moore, Cooper, Callahan, Comfort, Covert, Crook, Esposito, Kelly, & Richardson, 1986:7

169 See, for example, Guyton & Antonelli, 1987; Kluender, 1984b.

170 Anderson, Detwiler, Kirk & Mahoney, 1983:34.

171 American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1985c:6-7.

172 Murray, 1986:19. Also, see: Marshall, Sears & Otis-Wilborn, 1988.

173 Nelson & Wood, 1985.

174 Keith, 1987.

175 Keith, 1987: 23. See, also: Hawley, 1983.

176 Hawley, 1986:1. See, also: Murray, 1986.

177 American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1983b. It is appropriate at this juncture to emphasize that, while brief, paragraph-long descriptions such as these are found in several publications (e.g., Sikula & Roth, 1984; U.S. Department of Education, 1984; Watkins, 1983; American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1983c; Monaham, 1986), our review consisted *only* of programs which were described at some length in journal articles, books, monographs, or ERIC documents.

178 Teacher Education Quality Initiative Widespread, 1983: 2, 6.

179 Ashton & Crocker, 1987; Berliner, 1985.

180 For exceptions to this see, for example: Jones & Barnes, 1984; McCaleb, Borko, Arends, Garner & Mauro, 1987; Sears, Moyer & Marshall, 1986.

181 See, for example, Monaham, 1986; Smith, 1982.

182 Tom, 1980.

183 Descriptions and results of the attempt are found in the July-August 1984 issue of the Journal of Teacher Education [volume 35, number 4].

184 Egbert, 1984:9.

185 Lanier, 1984:25.

186 Lanier, 1984:27.

187 Anderson, 1982.

188 Anderson, 1982:1.

189 Reid, 1987.

190 Scannell, 1984:133.

191 McCaleb, Borko, Arends, Garner, & Mauro, 1987:63.

192 Hanes, Kemper, & Mulhern, 1986.

193 Mann, Hines, Swarzman, Roth, & Homan, 1986.

194 See, for example, Tyler, 1985.

195 Southern Regional Educational Board, 1986:6.

196 Lanier, 1984:27.

197 Guyton & Antonelli, 1987:48.

198 See, for example, Hopfengardner, Lasley & Joseph, 1983; McEvey & Morehead, 1986-87.

199 Boser, Wiley and Pettibone, 1986.

200 This report does make it clear that "academically talented" students can be recruited into teaching under the right circumstances, a finding substantiated by an unrelated study of similarly-recruited students (Sears, Moyer and Marshall, 1986).

201 Nelson & Wood, 1985: 56.

202 Schumacher, Esham & Bauer, 1985.

203 Schumacher, Esham & Bauer, 1985:120.

204 Soares, 1986.

205 Denton & Smith, 1983.

206 Boser, Wiley, & Pettibone, 1986.

207 See, for example: Andrew, 1981; Roth, Swarzman, Hines, & Mann, 1985-86.

208 That common themes are echoed in many of these reforms is partially explained, as Altbach (1985:18) undescores, by the fact that the impetus for the current reform movement did not emerge from the grass-root level but "came from the top of the corporate and education establishment. . . .[T]here is something of an interlocking directorate of individuals involved with the movement -- individuals who have served on more than one commission or who have served as consultants to several agencies." For similar discourse regarding the elite-directed agenda of the reform movement, see: Pincus, 1985; Popkewitz, 1985; Westbury, 1984.

209 For an elaboration of this point, see: Apple, 1987; Baldwin, 1987; Frymier, 1986; Hilbert, 1982; Raywid, 1985; Shapiro, 1985a; Sykes, 1987; Wise, 1979; 1988. For an analysis of the impact of state and federal educational policy on school governance, from a different point of view, see: Cohen, 1982. Also, for a discussion of the options for a federal role in education during the Reagan era, see: Florio, 1984; Guthrie, 1981; Miller, 1981.

210 Sykes, 1987:20. For a discussion of the problem posed in the de-skilling of teacher work through such curriculum reforms, see: Apple, 1982; Apple & Weiss, 1983; Carlson, 1982; Ginsburg, 1985; McNeil, 1986; Popkewitz, Tabachnick, & Wehlage, 1982. For a historical analysis of how educators of preceding generations have responded to earlier efficiency movements, see: Altenbaugh, 1987; Callahan, 1962; Katz, 1975; Tyack & Hansot, 1982.

211 Berman, 1985:109.

212 Green, 1986:4.

213 For a further discussion of the political context of educational reform, with particular reference to teacher preparation, and its relationships to the broader cultural and economic crisis, see: Carlson, 1985; Giroux & McLaren, 1986; Popkewitz, 1985; Sears, Marshall, Otis-Wilborn and Horton, 1988; Weiss, 1985. Studies which document linkages between socio-economic structure and educational/economic opportunities include: Alexander & Pallas, 1984; Apple & King, 1977; Borman & Spring, 1984; Everhart, 1983; McRobbie, 1978; Oakes, 198X; Rosenbaum, 1976; Rutter, et al., 1979; Weiss, 1985; Willis, 1977. For a critique of the limitations of this scholarship in the context of the reform movement, see Aronowitz & Giroux, 1987.

214 Giroux & McLaren, 1986:218.

215 Finkelstein, 1984:279; Shapiro, 1985b.

216 Shapiro, 1985a:71.

217 Berman, 1985; Lasch, 1985.

218 Greene, 1986:440.

219 Lanier, 1984:24.

220 American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1985b.

221 Yarger, 1988:2.

222 Hall, 1986:6. See, also: Ayers, 1986 for an example of a program with a longstanding formative evaluation component.

223 Fenstermacher, 1984:30.

224 Reid, 1987:15.

225 Worrest, Russell, Chance, & Mertens, 1983; Watts, 1986.
226 Goodman, 1986.

APPENDIX

	Descriptive Prescriptive Evaluative	Time of Reform		Breadth of Reform		Extended Program	Alt. Cert.	Recruitment	Liberal Arts	Professional Coursework
		Pre-1983	Post-1983	Whole	Part					
U.of Ala.	D		X		X					
Austin	D	X		X		X				X
Bank St.Col.	D	X			X	X				§
Bloomsburg U.	D	X		X						X
Bowling Green	D		X		X			X		
U.of Bridgeport	E	X		X			X			
Brown U.	D/E		X		X					§
Cent.Washington	D		X		X			X		
Col.of St.Teresa	D	X		§					X	X
U.of Dayton	D/E	X			X			X		
Denison U.	D	X			X					
Emporia St.U.	D/E	X			X					
U.of Florida	D	X		X		X				§
Grambling	D	X			X					§
Iowa St.	D		X		X					§
U.of Kansas	D/E	X		X		X				X

		Time of Reform		Breadth of Reform		Extended Program	Alt. Cert.	Recruitment	Liberal Arts	Professional Coursework
		Pre-1983	Post-1983	Whole	Part					
Knox Col.	D	X			X					§
U.of Louisville	P		X	§		X		X		
U.of Maine	D	X		X					X	§
U.of Maryland	D/E		X	X			§	X		§
U.of Mass.	D	X		X			§	X		
Memphis St.	D		X	§		X			X	X
Mercer U.	E	X		X						§
Michigan St.	D/E	X		X						
Mount Union	D	X			X					§
U.of New Hamp.	D/E	X		§		X		X		X
Radford	P		X	X						X
St. Cloud	D	X			X					§
San Fran.St.	D	X			X					§
U.S.C.	D		X	§		X			X	X
U.of So.Fla.	D/E	X		§	X			X		X
S.E.Missouri	P		X	X						X

		Time of Reform		Breadth of Reform		Extended Program	Alt. Cert.	Recruitment	Liberal Arts	Professional Coursework
		Pre-1983	Post-1983	Whole	Part					
Univ.of Tenn.(ITE)	D/E	X		X						X
U.of Tenn. (Lyndhurst)	E		X	X			§	X		
Texas A & M	D		X	§		X	§	X	X	X
Texas Tech	E	X		X			X			
U.of Toledo	D	X		X						
Trinity U.	D/E		X		X			X		X
U.of Va.	D		X	§		X			X	X
Va.Commonwealth	E		X		X					§
W.Montana	D	X			X			X		§
Winthrop	D		X	§				X		X
Wright St. U.	D		X	X			§	§		
Winthrop	D		X	X			X			
Doane	D		X	§		X				X
Total SCEDs	45	25	20	28	18	11	8			

Note:

"§" under Breadth/Whole denotes an overall redesign that is not an alt. cert. program.

"§" under Alt. Cert. denotes programs designed specifically for "high ability" students (5 of 7)

Half (6) of wholistic post-reform efforts were both overall redesign and extended programs. With the exception of Winthrop, all the rest were either alt. cert. (3) or recommended to become CBTE programs.

REFERENCES

Adams, R. (1983). A survey of AACTE member institutions regarding change in teacher education practice to improve the quality of graduates. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 237 494)

Adams, R., & Craig, J. (1983). A status report of teacher education program evaluation. Journal of Teacher Education, 34 (2), 33-36.

Alexander, K., & Pallas, A. (1984). Curriculum reform and school performance: An evaluation of the "new basics' American Journal of Education, 92(4), 391-420.

Altbach, P. (1985). The great education crisis. In P. Altbach, G. Kelly, & L. Weiss (Eds.), Excellence in Education. (pp. 13-27). Buffalo, NY: Prometheus.

Altenbaugh, R. (1987). Teachers and the workplace. Urban Education, 21 (4), 365-389.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1983a). Educating a profession: Beginning teacher preparation. Washington, DC: Author.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1983b). Teacher education quality initiatives widespread. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 238 589)

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1984). 1984 Report to the profession: Data show innovation, change. Special report. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 244 954)

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1985a). A call fo change in teacher education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 252 525)

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1985b). Teacher education and policy in the states: 50 state survey of legislative and administrative actions. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 257 833)

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1985c). Report to the profession. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 264 207)

American Association of State Colleges and Universities. (1986). Teacher education review: 1983-1986. A report to the presidents. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 276 720)

American Federation of Teachers. (1986). The revolution that is long overdue: Looking toward the future of teaching and learning. Washington, DC: Author.

Anderson, C. (1982). The use of codified knowledge in five teacher education programs: A comparative analysis. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 222 475)

Anderson, R., Detwiler, T., Kirk, J., & Mahoney, J. (1983). Establishing criteria of excellence for quality control in teacher education. In D. Jones (Ed.), Revitalizing teacher education in the mid-eighties (pp. 31-68). Proceedings of the 38th Annual Workshop of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Flagstaff, AZ, July 17 - August 5.

Andrew, M. (1981). A five year teacher education program: Success and challenges. Journal of Teacher Education, 32 (3), 40-43.

Andrew, M. (1983). The characteristics of students in a five year teacher education program. Journal of Teacher Education, 34(1), 20-23.

Andrew, M. (1984). Restructuring teacher education: The University of New Hampshire's five year program. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 250 310)

Andrew, M. (1986). Restructuring teacher education: The University of New Hampshire's five-year program. In T. Lasley (Ed.), The dynamics of change in teacher education, Volume I (pp. 59-88). Washington DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Anglin, L., Fox, G., Jr., & DeVault, M. (1981). A framework for discussing different approaches to teacher education. Improving College and University Teaching, 29 (1), 28-33.

Anrig, G. (1985). Educational standards, testing, and equity. Phi Delta Kappan, 66(9), 623-625.

Anrig, G. (1986). Teacher education and teacher testing: The rush to mandate. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(6), 447-451.

Antonelli, G. (1985). The revitalization of teacher education at UAPB. Action in Teacher Education, 7(3), 63-64.

Apple, M. (1981). [Review of State bureaucracy and curriculum control.] Curriculum Inquiry, 11 (4), 379-388.

Apple, M. (1982). Education and power. Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Apple, M. (1983). Culture, class and state: Reproduction and contradiction in education. Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Apple, M. (1985). Educational reports and economic realities. In P. Altbach, G. Kelly, & L. Weiss (Eds.), Excellence in education (pp. 91-105). Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.

Apple, M. (1987). Teachers and texts: A political economy of class and gender relations in education. Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Apple, M. (1987). Will the social content allow a tomorrow for "tomorrow's teachers?" Teachers College Record, 88, 330-337.

Apple, M., & King, N. (1977). What do schools teach? Curriculum Inquiry, 6(4), 341-369.

Apple, M., & Weiss, L. (1983). Ideology and practice in schooling. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University.

Arciniega, T. (1985). Equity, access, and quality control issues in teacher education. In R. Youst (Ed.), Partnership for excellence. (pp. 142-150). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 276 722)

Armstrong, W. (1944). The college and teacher education. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Armstrong, D., Savage, T., & Erion, R. (1986). Program improvement: Not by length alone. Action in Teacher Education, 8 (3), 33-36.

Aronowitz, S., & Giroux, H. (1987). Ideologies about schooling: Rethinking the nature of educational reform. Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 7(1), 7-38.

Ashton, P., & Crocker, L. (1987). Systematic study of planned variations: The essential focus of teacher education reform. Journal of Teacher Education,38(3), 1-8.

Ayers, J. (1986). Teacher education program evaluation: A case study past and future. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 275 669)

Bacharach, S., Bauer, S., & Shedd, J. (1986). The work environment and school reform. Teachers College Record, 88, 241-256.

Bagley, W., & Learned, W. (1920). The professional preparation of teachers for America's public schools. New York, NY: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Baldwin, E. (1987). Theory vs. ideology in the practice of teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education 38(1), 16-19.

Barr, R. (1985). The warranty, one year later. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(2), 144-146.

Barr, R. (1987). Reform of teacher education and the problem of quality assurance. Journal of Teacher Education, 38(5), 45-51.

Barr, R., & Schalock, D. (1986). Wingspread Conference on Quality Assurance in Teacher Education. Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University-Western Oregon State College School of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 276 175)

Barth, R. (1986). Of sheep and goats and school reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(4), 293-296.

Beach, J. (1982). Massachusetts: Out of step or ahead of times? (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 256 872)

Bell, D., et al. (1986). Approval of teacher education: The Arkansas model. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 274 660)

Bell, M., & Morsink, C. (1986). Quality and equity in the preparation of black teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(2), 15-51.

Bell, T. (1981). Redefining the federal role in education. Action in Teacher Education, 3 (2-3), 1-2.

Benner, S., George, T., & Cagle, L. (1987). Admission boards: The contribution of professional judgment to the admission process. Journal of Teacher Education 38(2), 7-11.

Berliner, D. (1986). Laboratory settings and the study of teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(6), 2-8.

Berman, E. (1985). The improbability of meaningful educational reform. Issues in Education, 3(2), 99-112.

Beyer, L. (1984). Field experience, ideology, and the development of critical reflectivity. Journal of Teacher Education, 35(3), 36-41.

Blass, R., & Dunbar, J. (1986). Teacher education reform at Allegheny College. Educational Horizons,64(2), 87-89.

Bliss, T., Evans, P., & Shaw, R. (1986). School/university partnerships: Teacher education and secondary school reform at Brown University. Teacher Education Quarterly, 13 (2), 50-58.

Borman, K., & Spring, J. (1984). Schools in central cities. Structure and process. New York: Longman.

Boser, J., Wiley, P., & Pettibone, T. (1986). A comparison of participants in traditional and alternative teacher preparation programs. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 278 648)

Bush, R. (1987). Teacher education reform: Lessons from the past half century. Journal of Teacher Education, 38(3), 13-19.

Boyer, E. (1983). High school: A report on secondary education in America. New York: Harper & Row.

Bradley, B. (1985). Thinking about self in the role of a teacher. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 260 024)

Brenner, S., Cagle, L., Sutefish, W. , & George, T. (1985). The Institute for Teacher Education: A focus for changing the teacher preparation process. Tennessee Education, 14 (3), 12-19.

Brouillet, F. (1987). Report to the legislature on the beginning teacher assistance program (BTAP), 1985-1986. Olympia, WA: Washington Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 277 657)

Brown, C. (1981). The relationship between teaching styles, personality and setting. In B. Joyce, C. Brown & L. Peck (Eds.), Flexibility in Teaching. (pp. 94-100). New York: Longman.

Brunner, J. (1983). Thoughts on school reform. In R. Bossone & I. Polishook (Eds.), Proceedings of the Conference of the University Urban Schools National Task Force. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 242 811)

Bruno, J., & Marcoulides, G. (1985). Equality of educational opportunity at racially isolated schools: Balancing the need for teacher certification with teacher shortage. Urban Review, 17(3), 155-165.

Buchmann, M. (1984). The use of research knowledge in teacher education and teaching. American Journal of Education 92(4), 421-439.

Burch, B., & James, T. (1985). Early field experiences: A collaborative model for induction, mentoring, and integration of theory and practice. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 265 097)

Burrows, L. (1985). Dare we build a new teacher education program? (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 262 022)

Bush, R. (1987). We know how to train teachers: Why not so so! Journal of Teacher Education, 28(6), 5-9.

Bush, R., & Bock, J. (1982). Institutionalization of educational change: Case studies of Teacher Corps influence on schools of education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 212 573)

Buttery, T., Henson, K., Ingman, T., & Smith, C. (1985-86). The teacher in residence partnership program. Action in Teacher Education, 7(4), 63-74.

California Commission on the Teaching Profession. (1985). Who will teach our children? A strategy for improving California's schools. The report of the California Commission on the Teaching Profession. Sacramento, CA: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 265 672)

California State Postsecondary Commission. (1986). Expanding educational equity in California's schools and colleges. Recommendations of the Intersegmental Policy Task Force on Assembly Concurrent Resolution 83. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 270 019)

Callahan, R. (1962). Education and the cult of efficiency. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Carlson, D. (1982). 'Updating' individualism and the work ethic. Curriculum Inquiry, 12(2), 125-160.

Carlson, D. (1985). Curriculum and the school work culture. In P. Altbach, G. Kelly, & L. Weiss (Eds.), Excellence in Education, (p. 171-181). Buffalo, NY: Prometheus.

Carnegie Corporation. (1983). Education and economic progress: Toward a national educational policy. New York: Author.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. New York: Author.

Case, C., Lanier, J., & Miskel, C. (1986). The Holmes Group Report: Impetus for gaining professional status for teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(4), 36-43.

Chance, W. (1987). . . . the best of education. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Changing course. A 50-state survey of reform measures. (1985, February 6). Education Week, pp. 11-30.

Charters, W., & Wapels, D. (1929). The Commonwealth teacher training study. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Chronicle of Higher Education. (1986). Governors call on colleges to develop programs to measure student learning. Chronicle of Higher Education, 33(1), 78-79.

Clark, R., & Fischetti, J. (1987). Candidate selection in a fifth year teacher education recruitment model: A multi-stage partnership approach. Journal of Teacher Education, 38(2), 26-30.

Coalition of Teacher Education Programs. (1986). COTEEP: A cooperative effort to improve teacher education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 273 616)

Cohen, D. (1982). Policy and organization: The impact of state and federal educational policy on school governance. Harvard Educational Review, 52(4), 474-499.

Cohen, D. (1984). The conditions of teachers' work. Harvard Educational Review, 54 (1), 11-15.

Combs, M. (1983). Proceedings of the Oklahoma Education Research Symposium II: Implications for H.B. 1706. Stillwater, OK. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 261 976)

Cooper, W. (1932). National survey of the education of teachers. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

Cooperman, S., & Klagholz, L. (1985). New Jersey's alternate route to certification. Phi Delta Kappan, 66(10), 291-295.

Cornbleth, C. (1986). Ritual and rationality in teacher education reform. Educational Researcher, 15(4), 5-14.

Corrigan, D. (1967). Conference on implications of recent research on teaching for teacher education. Washington, DC: Commission on the Implications of Recent Research in Teaching.

Corrigan, D. (1986). Agenda for educational reform. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 275 632)

Crabtree, V., & Geiger, J. (1983). Who cares about what: 13 organizations look at teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 34 (5), 30-33.

Cross, D. (1987). The adventures of education in wonderland: Implementing education reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(7), 496-502.

Cross, K. (1984). The rising tide of school reform reports. Phi Delta Kappan, 66(5), 167-172.

Cuban, L. (1984). School reform by remote control: SB 813 in California. Phi Delta Kappan 66(3),213-215.

Cuban, L. (1988). The managerial imperative: The practice of leadership in the schools. New York: State University of New York.

Culver, V., Eicher, B., Sacks, A. (1986). Confronting the teacher shortage: Are alternative certification programs the answer? Action in Teacher Education, 8(2), 19-23.

Cyphert, F., & Michelson, J. (1984). Teacher education redesign in Ohio: Past, present and future. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 253 538)

Darling-Hammond, L. (1984). Beyond the commission reports: The coming crisis in teaching. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 248 245)

Defino, M., & Hoffman, J. (1984). A status report and content analysis of state mandated teacher induction programs. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 251 438)

Darling-Hammond, L., & Berry, B. (in press). The evolution of teacher policy. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

deHart, F., & Connelly, R. (1985). Competency testing of teachers: An attitude survey of prospective teachers in private and public universities. Action in Teacher Education, 7(1-2). 89-103.

Denemark, G., & Nelli, E. (1980). Emerging patterns of institutional preparation for teachers. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 213 683)

Denemark, G., & Nutter, N. (1984). The case for extended programs of initial preparation. In. L. Katz & J. Raths (Eds.), Advances in teacher education, Volume I. (pp 203-240). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Denton, J., & Smith, N. (1983). Alternative teacher preparation programs: A cost effectiveness comparison. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 237 569)

DeYoung, A. (1986). Educational "excellence" versus teacher "professionalism": Toward some conceptual clarity. Urban Review, 18(1), 71-84.

Didham, C., & Kortokrax-Clark, D. (1987). Teacher education recruitment: A comprehensive marketing approach. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 278 640)

Dolce, C. (1981). Conservatism in America: What does it mean for teacher education? Journal of Teacher Education, 32 (4), 15-22.

Ducharme, E. (1986). The professors and the reports: A time to act. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(5), 51-56.

Duckworth, E. (1984). What teachers know: The best knowledge base . . . Harvard Educational Review, 54 (1), 15-20.

Dudley, R., & Helger, K. (1983). Building and sustaining: "Yes, buts . . ." are not allowed. Journal of Teacher Education, 34 (3), 21-25.

Duke, D. (1985). What is the nature of educational excellence and should we try to measure it? Phi Delta Kappan, 66(10), 671-674.

Edson, C. (1984). Risking the nation: Historical dimensions on survival and educational reform. Issues in Education, 1(3), 171-184.

Education Commission of the States (1982). Information society: Are high school graduates ready? Denver, CO: Author.

Education Commission of the States (1983). Action for excellence. Denver, CO: Author.

Education Economic Security Act (1984). PL 9833 (August 11). Washington, DC: 98th Congress.

Education Week. (1985). Changing course: A 50-state survey of reform measures. Education Week, (February 5), 11-30.

Egbert, R. (1980). Excellence in education. Journal of Teacher Education, 31 (2), 5-7.

Egbert, R. (1984). Improving teacher education through the use of research information. Journal of Teacher Education, 35(4), 9-11.

Egbert, R. (1985). The National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education: Final Report. Washington, DC: American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 271 467)

Elsner, K. (1984). First year evaluation results from Oklahoma's entry-year assistance program. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 242 706)

Evans, S., King, R., & Landers, M. (1986). A comprehensive plan for attracting able students to teacher education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 267 042)

Everhart, R. (1983). Reading, writing and resistance: Adolescence and labor in a junior high school. Boston, MA: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Everston, C., Hawley, W., & Zlotnik, M. (1984). The characteristics of effective teacher preparation programs: A review of research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 250 314)

External Review Committee for the Improvement of Teacher Education in Georgia. (1986). Improving undergraduate teacher education programs in Georgia. Atlanta, GA: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 277 659)

Fairweather, G., Turnatzky, L., Fergus, E., & Avellar, J. (1982). Innovation and social progress. New York: Pergamon.

Feinberg, L. (1983). Merit pay task force urgent test: General raises for all teachers called important. Washington Post (October 12) p. A1, ff.

Feinberg, W. (1987). The Holmes Group Report and the professionalization of teaching. Teachers College Record, 88, 366-377.

Feistritzer, C. (1983). The condition of teaching, A state-by-state analysis. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 238 869)

Feistritzer, C. (1984). The making of a teacher: A report on teacher education and certification. Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Information.

Fenstermacher, G. (1984). The Preservice Improvement Project in retrospect. Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (4), 28-30.

Final recommendations of the Commission on Quality Teaching. (1982). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 248 209)

Finkelstein, B. (1984). Education and the retreat from democracy in the United States, 1979-198? Teachers College Record, 86, 275-282.

Fisher, R., & Feldman, M. (1985). Some answers about the quality of teacher education students. Journal of Teacher Education, 36 (3), 37-40.

Flippo, R. (1985). Teacher certification testing across the United States and a consideration of some of the issues. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 260 115)

Florida Commission Report (1986). Faculty recruitment and personnel policies. A study prepared in response to appropriation items 508-511 of the 1985 General Appropriations Act. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 272 047)

Florio, D. (1984). Excellence in teacher education: Options for a federal partnership. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 253 542)

Florio, D. (1986). Excellence in teacher education: Options for a federal partnership. In T. Lasley (Ed.), Issues in Teacher Education, Volume II. (pp. 215-236). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Freeman, B. (Ed.) (1985). Exploring new frontiers in teacher education: The Austin Teacher Program, "Over a decade of pioneering." An exploration. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 249 187)

Friske, J., & Combs, M. (1986). Teacher induction programs: An Oklahoma perspective. Action in Teacher Education, 8(2), 67-74.

Frymier, J. (1986). Legislating centralization. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(9), 646-648.

Future of Teaching Committee. (1986). The future of teaching in Michigan: Setting the opportunity. Lansing, MI: Michigan State Board of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 276 704).

Gaff, J. (1983). General education today: A critical analysis of controversial practices and reforms. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Galambos, E. (1985). Teacher education: The anatomy of a college degree. Atlanta, GA: Southern Regional Education Board.

Galambos, E. (1986). Testing teachers for certification and recertification. In T. Lasley (Ed.), The dynamics of change in teacher education, Volume II (pp. 153-162). Washington DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1986). Teacher mentors: A review of the literature. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(1), 6-11.

Gallegos, A. (1981). The dilemma of extended/five year programs. Journal of Teacher Education 32(1), 4-6.

Garcia, P. (1985). A study of teacher competency testing and test validity with implications for minorities and the results and implications of the use of pre-professional skills tests (PPST) as a screening device for entrance into teacher education programs in Texas.

George, P. (1985). Teacher testing and the historically black college. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(6), 54-57.

Georgia State Department of Education. (1984). Action plan for education in Georgia. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 253 533)

Gibney, T., Johnson, J., Maynard, C., Nussel, E., Rusche, P., & Wiersma, W. (1987). CBTE past and present, The Toledo experience. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 280 818)

Gideonese, H. (1984). State educational policy in transition: Teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 66, 205-208.

Gifford, B. (1985). A modest proposal: Increasing the supply of minority teachers. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 260 027)

Ginsburg, M. (1985). Reproduction, contradiction and conceptions of curriculum in preservice teacher education. Curriculum Inquiry, 16(3), 283-309.

Giroux, H. (1984). Public philosophy and the crisis in education. Harvard Educational Review, 54(2), 186-194.

Giroux, H., & McLaren, P. (1986). Teacher education and the politics of engagement: The case for democratic schooling. Harvard Educational Review, 56 (3), 213-230.

Goertz, M., Ekstrom, R., & Coley, R. (1984). The impact of state policy on entrance into the teaching profession. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Goertz, M., & Pitchor, B. (1985). The impact of NTE use by states on teacher selection. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Goodlad, J. (1983). Teaching: An endangered profession. Response to Donna Kerr. Teachers College Record, 84, 575-578.

Goodlad, J. (1986). Toward a more perfect union. State Educational Leader, 5(2), 1,8.

Goodman, J. (1986). University education courses and the professional preparation of teachers: A descriptive analysis. Teaching and Teacher Education, 2(4), 341-353.

Governor's Educational review Commission. (1984). Preliminary findings of the personnel committee. Atlanta, GA.

Graham, P. (1987). Black teachers: A drastically scarce resource. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(8), 598-605.

Graham, P., & Million, S. (1986). Overcoming teacher shortages: The South Carolina alternative certification program. The Palmetto Administrator, 1(1), 21 & 24.

Grant, C., & Sleeter, C. (1985). Equality, equity and excellence. In P. Altbach, G. Kelly, & L. Weiss (Eds.), Excellence in Education. (pp. 139-159). Buffalo, NY: Prometheus.

Green, J. (1986). Draw on the talent of teachers, say the scholars. State Educational Leader, 5(2), 4-5.

Green, T. (1983). Excellence, equity and equality. In L. Schulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of Teaching and Policy. (pp. 318-341). New York: Longman.

Greene, M. (1984a). 'Excellence,' meanings, and multiplicity. Teachers College Record, 86(2), 283-297.

Greene, M. (1984b). Excellence and the basics. In C. Eisele (Ed.), Current Issues in Education. (pp. 22-28). Normal, IL: John Dewey Society.

Greene, M. (1984c). Comments on excellence in teacher education. Testimony presented at an open hearing of the National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 250 306)

Greene, M. (1986). In search of a critical pedagogy. Harvard Educational Review, 56(4), 427-441.

Griffin, G. (1985). Teacher induction: Research issues. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(1), 42-46.

Guthrie, J. (1981). The evolution of federal educational policy. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 206 115)

Guyton, E., & Antonelli, G. (1987). Educational leaders' reports of priorities and activities in selected areas of teacher education reform. Journal of Teacher Education, 38 (3), 45-49.

Haberman, M. (1986). An evaluation of the rationale for required teacher education beginning teachers with or without teacher preparation. In T. Lasley (Ed.), Issues in Teacher Education, Volume I, (pp. 7-53). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Hacker, A. (1984). The schools flunkout. The New York Review of Books, 31(6), 35-40.

Hall, G. (1986). Beyond the looking glass. Recommendations and critical warnings for teacher education practitioners, policymakers and researchers. A synthesis of the Beyond the Looking Glass Conference. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 270 451)

Hall, G., Hoffman, J., & Doyle, W. (1986). The schools and preservice education: Expectations and reasonable solutions. In T. Lasley (Ed.), The dynamics of change in teacher education, Volume I (pp. 19-28). Washington DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Hall, J. (Ed.). (1982). In opposition to core curriculum: Alternative models for undergraduate education. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

Hammes, R. (1985). Testing the teacher: A legal perspective. Action in Teacher Education, 7(3), 13-19.

Hanes, M., Kemper, R., Mulhern, J. (1986). Designing a professionally-responsive teacher education curriculum. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(2), 26-31.

Hansgen, R. (1983). A clinical professorship. Action in Teacher Education, 5(1-2), 21-32.

Harap, H. (1951). Preparation of teachers in the area of curriculum and instruction. Monograph No. 2). National Society for Colleges Teachers of Education. Austin, TX: University of Texas.

Haroutunian-Gordon, S. (1987). Evaluating teachers: The case of Socrates. Teachers College Record, 89(1), 117-132.

Harvard Educational Review. (1984). Symposium on the Year of the Reports. Harvard Educational Review 54(1), 1-31.

Harvey, W., Madaus, G., & Kreitzer, A. (1987). Charms talismanic: Testing teachers for the improvement of American education. In E. Rothkopf (Ed.), Review of Research in Education, Vol. 14 (pp. 169-238). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Hatton, B. (1988). A game plan for ending the minority teacher shortage. NEA Today, 6(6), 66-69.

Hawisher, M. (1985). Winthrop College transformed curriculum. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 262 015)

Hawk, P. (1986-87). Beginning teacher programs: Benefits for the experienced educator. Action in Teacher Education, 8(3), 59-63.

Hawley, W. (1983). Teacher education that promotes educational excellence: How to know it when you see it. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 241 150)

Hawley, W. (1986). Notes on the redesign of teacher education. Teachers for the future: What do we want? (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 277 662)

Hawley, W. (1987). Improving teacher education without five-year programs. American Journal of Education, 95(2), 275-298.

Hazlett, J. (1984). Alternative certification. Contemporary Education, 56(1), 46-48.

Hegler, K., & Dudley, R. (1987). Beginning teacher induction: A progress report. Journal of Teacher Education, 38(1), 53-56.

Hilbert, R. (1982). Competency-based teacher education versus the real world: Some natural limitations to bureaucratic reform. Urban Education, 16(4), 379-398.

Hitz, R., & Roper, S. (1986). The teacher's first year: Implications for teacher educators. Action in Teacher Education, 8(3), 65-71.

Hodenfield, G., & Stinnett, T. (1961). The education of teachers: Conflict and consensus. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hoffman, J., Edwards, S., Pouwlissen, M., O'Neal, S., & Barnes, S. (1985). A study of state mandated beginning teacher programs and their effects. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(4), 16-21.

Holmes Group, Inc. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Holt, L., & Peterson, K. (1981). University and public school cooperation for professional growth. Action in Teacher Education, 3(1), 65-75.

Hood, S., & Parker, L. (1986). Preliminary considerations of Illinois education reform legislation: Teacher competency testing. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 270 426)

Hopfengardner, J. Lasley, J., & Joseph, E. (1983). Recruiting preservice teacher education students. Journal of Teacher Education, 34(4), 10-13.

Howe, H. (1984). Giving equity a chance in the excellence game. Martin Buskin Memorial Lecture. Washington, DC: Education Writers Association.

Howsman, R., Corrigan, D., Denemark, G., & Nash, R. (1985). Educating a profession. Reprint with postscript, 1985. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 270 430)

Huling-Austin, L., Putman, S., & Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1986). Final report: Model teacher induction project study findings. Austin, TX: University of Texas Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Illinois Commission on the Improvement of Elementary and Secondary Education. (1984). Excellence in the making. Springfield, IL: Illinois State Board of Education.

Imig, D. (1983). Statement of David Imig, Executive Director, AACTE. In Oversight on Teacher Preparation (pp. 25-44). Hearing before the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. (Nov. 17). Washington, DC: U.S. Congress. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 241 507).

Imig, D. (1985a). Panel on "teacher education reform." (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 262 024)

Imig, D. (1985b). Teacher education. In J. Mangieri, (Ed.), Excellence in education (pp. 117-152). Fort Worth, TX: Texas Christian University.

Intergovernmental Advisory Council on Education. (1985). A report to the President of the United States from the Intergovernmental Advisory Council on Education: National networking conference on teacher preparation and retention. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 265 099)

Isler, R. (1985). Teacher competency testing Texas style. Action in Teacher Education, 7(1-2), 27-30.

Jackson, P. (1983). The reform of science education: A cautionary tale. Daedalus, 112(Spring): 143-166.

Jones, A., & Barnes, C. (1984). The California Consortium: A case study of seeking change in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education 35(6), 5-10.

Jones, D. (1983). Revitalizing teacher education in the mid-eighties. Proceedings of the Annual Workshop of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 236 152)

Jones, D. (1985). The human dimension of teacher education. Proceedings of the Annual Summer Workshop of the North Central Accrediting Association and American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 257 795)

Kaestle, C. (1985). Education reform and the swinging pendulum. Phi Delta Kappan 66(6), 422-423.

Katz, L., Raths, J., Mohanty, C., Kurachi, A., & Irving, J. (1981). Follow-up studies: Are they worth the trouble? Journal of Teacher Education, 32 (2), 18-22.

Katz, M. (1975). Class, bureaucracy and schools: The illusion of educational change in America. New York: Praeger.

Katz, M. (1980). Reflections on the purpose of educational reform. Educational Theory, 30 (2), 77-87.

Kearns, J. (1984). State competency testing for teacher certification. Journal of Teacher Education, 35(2), 58-61.

Keesbury, F. (1984). Who wrecked the schools? Thirty years of criticism in perspective. Educational Theory, 34 (3), 209-217.

Keith, M. (1987). We've heard this song . . . Or have we? Journal of Teacher Education, 38 (3), 20-25.

Kellams, S. (1985). Current general and liberal education reform efforts: The cycle continues. Educational Studies, 16 (2), 117-126.

Keller, P. (1982). Getting at the core: Curriculum reform at Harvard. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Keppel, F. (1986). A field guide to the land of teachers. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(1), 18-23.

Kimball, B. (1986). The training of teachers, the study of education, and the liberal disciplines. Educational Theory, 36(1), 15-21.

King, J. (1985). Holmes sweet Holmes. Paper presented at the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. Bal Harbour, FL.

Kirst, M., & Garms, W. (1980). The political environment of school finance policy in the 1980s. In J. Guthrie (Ed.), School finance policies and practices. (pp. 47-55). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Kluender, M. (1984a). The Nebraska Consortium for the Improvement of Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 253 537)

Kluender, M. (1984b). Teacher education programs in the 1980s: Some selected characteristics. Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (4), 33-35.

Knight, J. (1981). Who shall control entry to teacher education? North Carolina quality assurance program. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 209 225)

Kortokrax-Clark, D. (1986-87). The minority teacher shortage: An overview and a solution. Action in Teacher Education, 8(3), 7-13.

Kowalski, T. (1985). Teacher education: Here's help for separating fact from fiction. American School Board Journal,172(5), 41; 46.

Kunkel R., & Dearmin, E. (1981). The political and ideological development of a fifth year statewide internship. Journal of Teacher Education 32 (1), 19-23.

Lacetti, S. (1986). Shortage of minority teachers termed a "crisis." Black Issues in Higher Education, 3(1), 1-2.

Lahren, S., Jr. (1983). The problem of recruiting and retaining teachers for rural areas: An application of anthropological concepts and methods in a Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 243 640)

Lang, H., & Petracek, R. (1984). The model of teacher education suggested by the literature on reform. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 272 509)

Lanier. J. (1984). The Preservice Teacher Education Improvement Project: A critical review. Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (4), 24-27.

Lasch, C. (1985). 'Excellence' in education: Old refrain or new departure? Issues in Education 3(1), 1-12.

Lazerson, M., McLaughlin, J., & McPherson, B. (1984). New curriculum, old issues. Teachers College Record, 86(2), 299-319.

Leach, J., & Solomon, L. (1984). Performance-based certification in Georgia: Past and present. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 253 540)

Learned, W., & Wood, B. (1938). The student and his knowledge. New York, NY: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Lightfoot, S. (1983). The good high school. New York: Basic Books.

Lindsey, M. (1961). New horizons for the teaching profession. Washington, DC: National Commission on Teacher Education of the National Education Association.

Lines, P. (1985). Testing the teacher: Are there legal pitfalls? Phi Delta Kappan, 66(9), 618-622.

Lortie, D. (1966). Teacher socialization: The Robinson Crusoe model. In D. Lortie (Ed.), The real work of the beginning teacher, (pp. 54-66). Washington, DC: National Educational Association.

Mackey, J. (1977). Effective teacher education. Peabody Journal of Education 54(4), 231-238.

Madus, G., & Pullin, D. (1987). Teacher certification tests: Do they really measure what we need to know? Phi Delta Kappan, 69(1), 31-38.

Major reports on teacher education: What do they mean for the states? (1986). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 275 633)

Mann, M., Hines, C., Swarzman, J., Roth, R., & Homan, S. (1986). The challenge of change: Attracting and retaining academically talented teacher candidates. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 271 432)

Marshall, C. (1985). Politics of evaluation: The competition for control of educational policy. Urban Education, 19(4), 411-439.

Marshall, J., & Moyer, P. (1987). Building strong foundations for teacher-leaders: The Brackenridge Internship in Teaching projects' first year curriculum. Teaching Education, 1(2), 38-41.

Marshall, J., Sears, J., Fulton, T., & Otis-Wilborn, A. (1987). The Brackenridge Internship in Teaching Program: Operationalizing teacher education reform. Teacher Education, 31(2), 22-29.

Marshall, J., Sears, J., & Otis-Wilborn, A. (1988). The recruitment and induction of 'quality' students into teacher education: A case study. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA, April 4-9.

Maryland Commission on Quality Teaching. (1982). Final Recommendations of the Commission on Quality Teaching. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 248 209)

McCaleb, J., Borko, H., Arends, R., Garner, R., & Mauro, L. (1987). Innovation in teacher education: The evolution of a program. Journal of Teacher Education, 38(4), 57-64.

McDaniel, T. (1986). Reforming teacher education: Thoughts on the dynamics of change. Journal of Thought 21(4), 46-49.

McDill, E., et al. (1986). A population at risk: Potential consequences of tougher school standards for student dropouts. American Journal of Education, 94(2), 135-181.

McEvoy, B., & Moorehead, M. (1986). Teacher induction: What can a university do best? Action in Teacher Education, 8(3), 45-49.

McNeil, L. (1986). Contradictions of control: School structure and school knowledge. New York, NY: Methuen/Routledge & Kegan Paul.

McNett, I. (1983). Demographic imperatives: Implications for educational policy. American Council on Educational Organization Leaders. Institute for Educational Leadership.

McRobbie, A. (1978). Working class girls and the culture of femininity. In Women Study Group (Ed.), Woman take issue: Aspects of women's subordination. (pp. 96-108). London: Hutchinson.

Meade, E. (1984). Recent reports on education: Some implications for preparing teachers. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 250 303)

Medley, D. (1984). A valid teacher competency test: Is such a thing possible? Journal of Human Behavior, 1(1), 15-22.

Mehlinger, H. (1986). A risky venture. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(1), 33-35.

Mendoza, A., & Kossack, S. (1981). The state of Florida: A case study in governmental assessment legislation. Action in Teacher Education, 3(4), 17-23.

Mertens, S., & Yarger, S. (1982). Escape from deja' vu: On strengthening teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 33(4), 8-12.

Mercer, J. (1984). Teacher education admission requirements: Alternatives for black prospective teachers and other minorities. Journal of Teacher Education, 35(1), 26-29.

Michigan Governor's Office. (1984). Governor's educational summit task force report. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 254 936)

Miller, R. (1981). The federal role in education: New directions for the eighties. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 207 191)

Mitchell, D., & Encarnation, D. (1984). Alternating state policy mechanisms for influencing school performance. Educational Researcher, 13(5), 4-11.

Minnesota Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education. (1985). Minnesota Association of Colleges for Teacher Education Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education report. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 256 740)

Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board. (1986). Minnesota's vision for teacher education: Stronger standards, new partnerships. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 274 662)

Monahan, W. (1984). Teacher education in the '90s: A working paper. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 257 782)

Monahan, W. (1986). The potential bifurcation of American teacher education: A point of view. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 275 640)

Moore, J., Cooper, J., Callahan, C., Comfort, R., Covert, R., Crook, P., Esposito, J., Kelly, L., & Richardson, P. (1986). Five year program of teacher education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 270 419)

Morales, C. (1983). Teacher certification at the threshold in Florida. Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, 49(3), 35-39.

Mulhern, J. (1985). The challenge of reform in teacher education: An historical perspective of program changes in teacher education at the University of South Carolina, 1982-1984. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 266 106)

Murray, D. (1985). Conditions of teacher education in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. A special report on estimating supply and demand and related issues. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 265 133)

Murray, F. (1986). Teacher education. Change, 18(6), 19-25.

Murray, J. (1982). The extended program for teacher training: A procedural critique. Journal of Teacher Education, 33 (5), 2-5.

Nash, R., & Ducharme, E. (1983). Where there is no vision, the people perish: A nation at risk. Journal of Teacher Education, 34(4), 38-46.

National Center for Educational Statistics. (1983). The condition of education. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education and Author.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

National Commission on Teacher Education. (1985). A call for change in teacher education. Washington, DC: American Association for Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 252 525)

National Education Association. (1982). Excellence in our schools. Teacher education: An action plan. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 246 046)

National Education Association. (1985). The NEA's plan for school reform. In B. Gross & R. Gross (Eds.), The Great School Debate. (pp. 405-419). New York: Simon and Schuster.

National Education Association. (1986). Estimates of school statistics, 1985-1986. West Haven, CT: Author.

National Science Board. (1983). Educating Americans for the 21st century. Commission on pre college education, mathematics, science and technology. Washington, DC: Author.

National Society of College Teachers of Education. (1935). Studies in education: The education of teachers. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

Nelms, C. (1982). Minorities and the professions. Action in Teacher Education, 4(2), 47-52.

Nelson, B., & Wood, L. (1985). The competency dilemma. Action in Teacher Education, 7(1-2), 45-57.

Newman, F., & Kelly, T. (1985). Excellence and the dignity of students. In B. Gross & R. Gross (Eds.), The Great School Debate, (pp. 222-228). New York: Simon and Schuster.

New York State Board of Regents. (1983). Proposed action plan to improve elementary and secondary education results in New York. Albany, NY: Author.

New York State Education Department. (1986). Report of the 1985-1986 Regents Commissioner's regional conferences on strengthening teaching in New York state. Albany, NY: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 272 477)

Northeast Regional Exchange. (1985). The national reports on education: A comparative analysis. In B. Gross & R. Gross (Eds.), The Great School Debate, (pp. 50-71). New York: Simon and Schuster.

Nussel, E. (1986). What the Holmes Group Report doesn't say. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(1), 36-38.

Oakes, J. (1985). Keeping track: How schools structure inequality. New Haven, CT: Yale University.

Odden, A. (1986). Sources of funding for education reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(5), 335-340.

O'Dell, S. (1986). A model university-school system collaboration in teacher education. Kappa Delta Pi, 22(4), 120-121.

Ohio Board of Regents. (1981). Advisory Commission on Articulation between Secondary Education and Ohio Colleges. Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 252 107)

Ohio Commission on Educational Excellence. (1983). Responsible reform: Focusing on the future. Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Education.

Oklahoma State Department of Education. (1981). Policies and procedures handbook for House Bill 1706. Oklahoma City, OK: Author.

Oliver, B., & McKibbin, M. (1985). Teacher trainees: Alternative credentialing in California. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(3), 20-23.

Olsen, L. (1987). An overview of the Holmes Group. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(8), 619-621.

Otis-Wilborn, A., Sears, J., Marshall, J. (1988). Developing and enhancing commitment to careers of low or moderate status within postsecondary education: The case of teaching. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, LA.

Palaich, B. (1983). State policies to screen and attract teachers. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 234 506)

Passow, A. (1984). Reforming schools in the 1980s: A critical review of the national reports. (ERIC Reproduction Reproduction Service No. ED 242 850)

Peek, P. (1985). A successful field-based program at Mercer University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 258 945)

Perry, C., Kristo, J., & Rog, J. (1984). The collaborative effort of redesign in teacher education: The planning and implementation process. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 258 930)

Peseau, B. (1986). Funding and academic production of teacher education in state universities and land grant colleges, 77 Universities, 1984-1985. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 272 489)

Petrie, H. (1985). Educational reform and teacher education. In P. Altbach, G. Kelly, & L. Weiss (Eds.), Excellence in education (pp. 233-249). Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.

Pigge, F. (1985). Teacher education graduates: Comparisons of those who teach and do not teach. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(4), 27-28.

Pincus, F. (1985). From equity to excellence: The rebirth of educational conservatism. In B. Gross & R. Gross (Eds.), The Great School Debate. (pp. 329-344). New York,NY: Simon & Schuster.

Pink, W. (1986). Facilitating change at the school level: A missing factor in school reform. Urban Review, 18(1), 19-30.

Pipho, C. (1984). The momentum of educational reform: States on the move. Phi Delta Kappan, 66 (2), 85-86.

Planning for change in teacher education at Bloomsburg University. An ongoing comprehensive evaluation. (1984). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 248 208)

Pollock, L. (1983). Revitalizing teacher education through research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 236 152)

Pooler, A. (1984). Redesigned undergraduate teacher preparation program at the University of Maine-Orono. The clinical segment. Testimony presented at the open hearing of the National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education, New York, Oct. 18-19. Volume II. (pp. 63-68). (ERIC Reproduction Reproduction Service No. ED 250 306)

Popkewitz, T. (1985). A comparative perspective on American teacher education: Being a stranger in one's native land. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(5), 2-10.

Popkewitz, T., & Pittman, A. (1986). The idea of progress and the legitimation of state agendas: American proposals for school reform. Curriculum & Teacher, 1 (1-2), 11-24.

Popkewitz, T., Tabachnick B., & Wehlage, G. (1982). The myth of educational reform. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin.

Prakash, M., & Waks, L. (1985). Four conceptions of excellence. Teachers College Record, 87 (1), 79-101.

Prakash, M. (1986). Reforming the teaching of teachers: Trends, contradictions, and challenges. Teachers College Record, 88 (2), 217-240.

Putbrese, L. (1984). Middle level teacher preparation: A breath of fresh air. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 273 624)

Radck, M., & Bixler, J. (1983). Teacher education and spaceship earth. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 233 004)

Raywid, M. (1985). The coming centralization of education. In G. Gross & R. Gross (Eds.), The Great School Debate. (pp. 400-403). New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Raywid, M. (1987). Excellence and choice: Friends of foes? Urban Review, 19(1), 35-47.

The redesign of teacher education: A blueprint for excellence. (1986). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 280 802)

Reed, D. (1986). Wanted: Black teacher education students. Action in Teacher Education, 8 (1), 31-36.

Reid, W. (1987). Institutions and practices: Professional education reform and the language of reform. Educational Researcher, 16(8), 10-15.

Robards, S., & Hansan, R. (1985). Oklahoma's entry-year assistance program: Some findings after two years of implementation. Paper presented at the Oklahoma Education Research Symposium. Stillwater, OK.

Roberson, S., Keith, T., & Page, E. (1983). Now who aspires to teach? Educational Research, 12(6), 13-21.

Robinson, V. (1985). Making do in the classroom: A report on the misassignment of teachers. Washington, DC: Council for Basic Education and American Federation of Teachers.

Rodman, B (1985). At Grambling: "Fighting the scores instead of the tests." Education Week, 20(5), 4-6.

Romanish, B. (1987). A skeptical view of educational reform. Journal of Teacher Education, 38(3), 9-12.

Roose, D., Mitchell, S., & Rudman, M. K. (1985). Selecting the brightest and the best. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(3), 219-221.

Rosenbaum, J. (1976). Making inequality: The hidden curriculum of high school tracking. New York: Wiley.

Rosenholtz, S. (1985). Political myths about education reform: Lessons from research on teaching. Phi Delta Kappan, 66(5), 349-355.

Roth, R. (1984). Alternative futures for teacher education. Action in Teacher Education, 6 (4),1-5.

Roth, R. (1986). Alternative and alternative certification: Purposes, assumptions, implications. Action in Teacher Education, 8(2), 1-6.

Roth, R., Swarzman, J., Hines, C., & Mann, M. (1985-86). The university and the community: Partnerships for excellence in teacher education. Action in Teacher Education, 7(4), 29-34.

Rowls, M., & Hanes, M. (1982). Teacher recertification: The shift toward local control and government. Journal of Teacher Education, 33 (4), 24-28.

Royster, P., & Chernay, G. (1981). Teacher education: The impact of federal policy. Springfield, MA: Banister.

Rutter, M., Maugham, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J. (1979). Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Salganik, L. (1985). Why testing reforms are so popular and how they are changing education. Phi Delta Kappan, 66(9), 607-610.

Salman, R. (1981). Putting testers to test: Relating professional licensing examinations to practice. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 217 004)

Sandefur, J. (1984a). Competency assessment of teachers: 1980-1983. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 238 858)

Sandefur, J. (1984b). Standards for admission to teacher education programs. An issue paper prepared for the Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 251 417)

Sandefur, J. (1985). Competency assessment of teachers. Action in Teacher Education, 7(1-2), 1-12.

Sarason, S., Davidson, K., & Blatt, B. (1962). The preparation of teachers. New York, NY: Wiley.

Saunders, R. (1984). Efforts to reform teacher education in Tennessee: A ten year analysis. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 253 539)

Saunders, R. (1986). New way to prepare new teachers. State Educational Leader, 5(2), 2-3.

Scannell, D. (1984). The University of Kansas extended teacher education program. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 253 536)

Scannell, D., & Guenther, J. (1981). The development of an extended program. Journal of Teacher Education, 32 (1), 7-12.

Schalock, H. (1987). The central issue in teacher warranties: Quality assurance for what? Journal of Teacher Education, 38(5), 52-55.

Schenkat, R., Battaglini, D., & Rosen, S. (1985). It stands to reason. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 263 059)

Schon, D. (1984). The reflective practitioner. Cambridge, MA: MIT.

Schumacher, S., Esham, K., & Bauer, D. (1985). Evaluation of a collaborative teacher education program: Planning, development and implementation, phase III. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 268 119)

Sears, J., & Moyer, P., & Marshall, J. (1986). A longitudinal study of a demonstration project related to the recruitment, preparation and retention of highly qualified persons for the teaching profession: The Brackenridge Interns -- the first year. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 272 454)

Sears, J., Otis-Wilborn, A., & Marshall, J. (1987). Investigating model teacher education reform: Acclimation -- entering the teaching profession. Paper presented at the Midwest Educational Research Association Conference. Chicago, IL. October 22-25.

Sears, J., Marshall, J., Otis-Wilborn, A., & Horton, T. (1988). The political economy of teacher training: Attracting high-ability persons into teaching, a critique. Paper presented at the Eastern Educational Research Association Conference. Miami, FL. February 24-27.

Shaker, P., & Ullrich, W. (1987). Reconceptualizing the debate over the general education of teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 38 (1), 11-15.

Shapiro, S. (1985a). Capitalism at risk: The political economy of the educational reports of 1983. Educational Theory, 35 (1), 57-72.

Shapiro, S. (1985b). If you won't work Sunday, don't come in Monday. In B. Gross & R. Gross (Eds.), The Great School Debate. (pp. 363-368). New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Shepard, L., & Kreitzer, A. (1987). The Texas teacher test. Educational Researcher, 16(6), 22-31.

Shepherd, G., & Gallaher, T. (1985). An investigation of the content topics and process methods of communicating the professional expectations of induction year certification programs. Action in Teacher Education, 7(1-2), 75-81.

Short, E. (Ed.), (1984). Competence: Inquiries into its meaning and acquisition in educational settings. New York: University Press of America.

Short, E. (1985). The concept of competence: Its use and misuse in education. Journal of Teacher Education, 36 (2), 2-6.

Sikula, J. (1986). Vision of reform: Implications for the education profession. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Sikula, J., & Roth, R. (1984). Teacher preparation and certification: The call for reform. Fastback 202. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 242 688)

Smith, B. (1980). Now is the time to advance pedagogical education. Educational Theory, 30 (3), 177-183.

Smith, D.(1982). The content in teacher education programs. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 217 029)

Smith, D. (1984). PROTEACH: An extended preservice teacher preparation program. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 250 317)

Smith, D. (1986). Policy issues in teacher education. In S. Packard (Ed.), The leading edge: Innovation and change in professional education. (pp. 65-77). Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Smith, D., & Wilson, G. (1984). The Florida beginning teacher program. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 253 541)

Smith, E. (1962). Teacher education: A reappraisal. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Smith, G. (1984). The critical issue of excellence and equity in competency testing. Journal of Teacher Education, 35 (2), 6-9.

Smith, N. (1979). The limitations of ERIC in reviewing evaluation literature. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 1 (1): 68-73.

Soares, L. (1986). A new model in teacher training. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 267 038)

Soder, R. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers for whom and for what? Missing propositions in the Holmes Group Report. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(6), 2-5.

Sokolow, J. (1983). Excellence in our schools. Journal of Teacher Education, 34(3), 59.

South Carolina State Department of Education. (1986). Approved teacher education programs in South Carolina, 1986-1987. Columbia, SC: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 278 663)

Southern Regional Education Board. (1981). The need for quality. Atlanta, GA: Author.

Southern Regional Education Board. (1985). Improving teacher education: An agenda for higher education and the schools. (ERIC Reproduction Reproduction Service No. ED 261 029)

Southern Regional Education Board. (1986). Major reports on teacher education: What do they mean for the states? Atlanta, GA: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 275 633)

Spero, J. (1986). The use of student financial aid to attract prospective teachers: A survey of state efforts. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 267 687)

Spring, J. (1985). Political and economic analysis. In P. Altbach, G. Kelly, & L. Weiss (Eds.), Excellence in education. (pp. 75-89). Buffalo, NY: Prometheus.

Stanard, M. (1985). West Virginia's professional education performance assessments: Quilt or patches? Action in Teacher Education, 7(1-2), 30-40.

Stedman, L., & Smith, M. (1983). Recent reform proposals for American education. Contemporary Education Review, 2(2), 87.

Stedman, L. & Smith, M. (1985). Weak arguments, poor data, simplistic recommendations. . . In B. Gross & R. Gross (Eds.), The Great School Debate. (pp. 83-105). New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Stiles, L., Barr, A., Douglas, H., & Mills, H. (1960). Teacher education in the United States. New York, NY: Ronald.

Stinnett, T. (1955). Teacher education: The decade ahead. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Study Commission on Undergraduate Education. (1976). Teacher education in the United States: The responsibility gap. Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska.

Swick, K., Rowls, M., & Kuhs, T. (1984). Educating teachers for today and tomorrow. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 244 926)

Sykes, G. (1983). Teacher preparation and the teacher workforce: Problems and prospects for the 80s. American Education, 19(2), 23-30.

Sykes, G. (1984). Teacher education and the predicaments of reform. In C. Finn, D. Ravitch, & R. Fancher (Eds.), Against Mediocrity: The humanities in America's high schools. (pp. 172-194). New York: Holmes & Meier.

Sykes, G. (1987). Reckoning with the spectre. Educational Researcher, 16(6), 19-21.

Symposium on the year of the reports. (1984). [Special issue] Harvard Educational Review, 54 (1).

Task Force for the Review of Public Education. (1982). Tennessee Comprehensive Education Study. Nashville: Tennessee General Assembly.

Task Force of the Business-Higher Education Forum. (1983). America's competitive challenge: The need for a national response. Washington, DC: Author.

Task Force on Education for Economic Growth. (1983). Action for Excellence. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Teacher education improvement project, 1985 - 1986. (1986). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 277 674)

Tesconi, C. (1984). Additive reform and the retreat from purpose. Educational Studies, 15 (1), 1-10.

Tetreault, M. & Schmuck, P. (1985). Equity, educational reform and gender. Issues in Education, 3(1), 45-67.

Tewell, K., & Trubowitz, S. (1987). The minority group teachers: An endangered species. Urban Education, 22(3), 355-365.

Thies-Springthall, L. (1986). A collaborative approach for mentor-training: A working model. Journal of Teacher Education, 37(6), 13-20.

Tom, A. (1980). The reform of teacher education through research: A futile quest. Teachers College Record, 82(1), 15-29.

Tom, A. (1985). Teacher education in liberal arts setting: Achievements, realities and challenges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 253 725)

Trout, D. (1943). The education of teachers. Berrien Spring, MI: College Press.

Twentieth Century Fund. (1983). Making the grade. New York: Author.

Tyack, D., & Hansot, E. (1982). Managers of virtue. New York: Basic Books.

Tyler, R. (1985). What we've learned from past studies of teacher education. Phi Delta Kappan, 66,(10), 682-684.

United States Department of Education. (1984). The nation responds: Recent efforts to improve education. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 240 748)

United States Congress. (1981). Teacher preparation: Problems and prospects. Hearings before the subcommittee on post-secondary education of the Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives ninety-seventh Congress, first session, September 9-10. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 217 019)

Urban, W. (198?). The illusion of educational reform in Georgia. Journal of Thought, 22 (2) ,31-36.

Vance, V., & Schlechty, P. (1982). The distribution of academic ability in the teaching force: Policy implications. Phi Delta Kappan, 64(1), 22-27.

Varah, L., Theune, W., & Parker, L. (1986). Beginning teachers: Sink or swim? Journal of Teacher Education, 36(1), 37-41.

Villeme, M., & Hall, B. (1985). The Florida teacher certification examination: Perceptions of those who have been required to take it. Action in Teacher Education, 7(1-2), 83-87.

Warren, D. (1985). Learning from experience: History and teacher education. Educational Researcher, 14(10), 5-12.

Warren H., Russell, J., Levy, J., Chance, B., & Martens, T. (1983). Strengthening the professional curriculum. In D. Jones (Ed.), Revitalizing teacher education the the mid eighties, (pp. 69-104). Proceedings of the 38th Annual Workshop of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Flagstaff, AZ, July 17-Aug. 5. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 236 152)

Watkins, B. (1983, September 7). Universities moving to raise quality of education schools. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 27 (2), 1; 14.

Watts, D. (1986a). Alternate routes to teacher certification: A dangerous trend. Action in Teacher Education, 8(2), 25-29.

Watts, D. (1986b). A school of pedagogy: Teacher education's model for excellence. Contemporary Education, 57(3), 126-129.

Weaver, T. (1983). America's teacher quality problem: Alternatives for reform. New York: Praeger.

Weiss, L. (1985). Excellence and student class, race, and gender cultures. In P. Altbach, G. Kelly, & L. Weiss (Eds.), Excellence in education (pp. 217-232). Buffalo, NY: Prometheus.

Westbury, I. (1984). A nation at risk. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 16(4), 431-445.

Wheeler, A. (1983). Response to the need for quality: The School of Education at Radford University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 237 510)

Wildavsky, A. (1981). Speaking truth to power: The art and craft of policy analysis. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Wiley, P. (1986). The Lyndhurst Fellowship Program: An alternative preparation/certification program. Tennessee Education 15(2), 18-22.

Willard, J., & Gordon, B. (1986-7). New challenges for teacher preparation institutions: Recruitment and retention. Action in Teacher Education, 8 (4), 19-24.

Willis, P. (1977). Learning to labour: How working class kids get working class jobs. Westmead, England: Saxon House.

Wilson, H. (1986). The disappearing black teacher. State Educational Leader, 5(4), 8,10.

Wise, A. (1979). Legislative learning: The bureaucratization of the American classroom. Berkeley, CA: University of Southern California.

Wise, A. (1988). Legislative learning revisited. Phi Delta Kappan 38(2), 328-333.

Wisniewski, R. (1986). Alternative programs and the reform of teacher education. Action in Teacher Education, 8(2), 37-44.

Witty, E. (1980). Proceedings at the national conference on problems, issues, plans and strategies related to the preparation and survival of black public school teachers. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 212 565)

Witty, E. (1982). Prospects for black teachers: Preparation, certification, and employment. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 213 659).

Worrest, H., Russell, J., Chance, B., & Mertens, T. (1983). Strengthening the professional curriculum. In D. W. Jones (Ed.), Revitalizing teacher education in the mid-eighties (pp. 69-104). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 236 152)

Yarger, S. (1988). Research about teacher education project. American Educational Research Association Division K Newsletter. Winter, 2-3.

Yelon, S., Barnes, H., Putnam, J., Freeman, D., & Bradley, B. (1983). Designing, implementing, and evaluating an experimental teacher education program emphasizing teacher decision making and planning.(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 229 361)

Yoder, W., & Janini, D. (1987). Teacher testing: A status report. American Educator, 23(1), 23-25.

You, I. (1983). Guidelines for the redesign of teacher education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 232 994)

Zeichner, K. (1986). Individual and institutional influences on the development of teacher perspectives. In J. Raths & L. Katz (Eds.), Advances in Teacher Education, Volume 2, (pp. 135-163. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.